

United States to request the United States Civil Service Commission to grant to civil-service employees who served in Hawaii during the period of active hostilities in World War II preference rights equivalent to those granted to military and Navy personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 6363. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the United States district court for the middle district of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Patuxent Development Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6364. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Matsumura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 6365. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Paul Somalis and Zoe Vassidiades Somalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 6366. A bill for the relief of Kyriakos George Kanellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 6367. A bill for the relief of Anthony Jandacek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 6368. A bill to recognize the men responsible for the design, development, and construction of the first airplane to fly across the Atlantic Ocean; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6369. A bill for the relief of Julien Musafia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6370. A bill for the relief of Constantine David, Paule David, Claire David, and Arlane David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 6371. A bill for the relief of J. O. Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1527. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Walter Burl, Hazel, S. Dak., and 15 others, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of liquor in public eating places; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1528. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the mayor, city of Ennis, Tex., requesting that the Chambers Creek project be declared an emergency so that construction may be begun as soon as feasible; to the Committee on Public Works.

1529. Also, petition of Polish-American Labor Council, Chicago, Ill., urging the Congress to take cognizance of the result of the Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Agreements, which have been so directly instrumental in bringing Poland and her neighbors under the yoke of communism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1530. Also, petition of Miss G. F. Hogan, New York, N. Y., relative to the social-security bill, H. R. 6000, and requesting that the \$50 penalty clause in the section headed "Reduction of benefits" be removed, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1531. Also, petition of Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union, Cleveland, Ohio, urging the Congress to give favorable consideration to legislation which would authorize the General Services Administra-

tor to furnish aid to local public-school agencies to assist them in the construction of adequate public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1532. Also, petition of John F. Linderman and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1533. Also, petition of Mrs. Lizzie Fleming and others, Valdosta, Ga., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1534. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution unanimously adopted by the American Aid for Expellees from Czechoslovakia and other European countries, requesting our Congress to do whatever possible to right the wrong to their relatives and friends who were dispossessed and expelled from countries of their birth because of their religious beliefs, their race, or national origin; and commending steps taken to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, that expellees and expellee orphans shall hereafter be admitted in fair proportion and on the same terms as other displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1535. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of New Jersey Bankers Association, advocating the passage of Senate bill 2006 and House bill 4710; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1949

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 3, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God and Father of us all, amid the maddening maze of things that fill our toiling days with fever and fret we would tarry now in the shelter of Thy shadowing wings. For this moment we would stay the noisy shuttle of time that we may catch a revealing glimpse of the larger pattern it is weaving. Tune our tangled lives to the harmony of Thy purpose. Before evening comes and our work is done may our glad eyes yet see some victory of liberty over tyranny, of righteousness over injustice, of brotherhood over ruthlessness, of peace over war, in our hearts, in our Nation, and in all the world. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 7, 1949, and Monday, October 10, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On October 6, 1949:

S. 2085. An act to amend the Employment Act of 1946 with respect to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

On October 10, 1949:

S. 2042. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to complete construction of the irrigation facilities and to contract with the water users on the Buffalo Rapids project, Montana, increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Bert H. Miller, late a Senator from the State of Idaho.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2960) to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. PACE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 12, 17, 18, 25, 27, 51, 55, 62, 71, 76, and 84 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 13, 87, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, and 100 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 73, 74, 77, 81, and 99 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4390. An act to authorize the conveyance, for school purposes, of certain land in Acadia National Park to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6230. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to School District No. 5, Linn County, Ore.;

H. R. 6259. An act to provide for the installation of a carillon in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, Fort Myer, Va., in memory of World War II dead; and

H. J. Res. 353. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion to preserve or dispose of material removed from the Executive Mansion during the period of renovation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2514) to enable the

Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION—REQUEST FOR MEETING OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have the privilege of sitting this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what the purpose of the meeting is to be?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know anything about it. I have no idea.

Mr. CAIN. I object.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased so to do.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Committee on the Judiciary is considering the displaced-persons legislation.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire of the Senator from Tennessee how many members of the Committee on the Judiciary are absent from the city?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In response to the question of the Senator, two members, I believe, are absent from the city. All other members are present, or were this morning.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I feel impelled to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Washington has not seen fit to grant this very reasonable request. Similar requests are made almost every day. I am sure that the Senator himself has been a member of committees the chairmen of which many times have requested, or the minority or majority leader on their behalf has requested, that the committees sit and perform the ordinary business of committees.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the time is getting pretty short in view of an early adjournment, and I am sure the Committee on the Judiciary would like to go ahead and finish its business as soon as possible. I do hope the Senator will withdraw his objection.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Illinois is entitled to a brief statement on my part, merely to advise the Senate the reasons for my opposition.

I was on the floor of the Senate a few days ago when there was read a telegram from the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is now in Europe, in which he expressed his considered opinion that action on the displaced-persons bill should not be had at this session of the Senate.

I am further advised of the substantial resistance of another distinguished Senator, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent in his own home State today because of a death in his family.

I am likewise conscious of the fact that on our calendar there is a petition to discharge the Committee on the Judi-

ciary from the further consideration of the displaced-persons bill.

Therefore, in view of the fact that certain Senators are not present who obviously would vote against reporting the bill from the Committee on the Judiciary, and because we have an instrument which will permit us to fight the issue out on the floor of the Senate, and in the name of fair play, I am duty bound to my own conscience to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, Mr. President, it is perfectly within the right of any Senator to object to any unanimous-consent request. The distinguished Senator from Washington apparently has in his own mind and his own conscience good reasons for objecting, and, obviously, I take no exception to the objection being made. However, I do desire to make a statement with respect to the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I was about to say that every Senator knows, but at least the Senator from Nevada knows, that he has been given due notice with respect to the taking up of the displaced-persons bill, and immediately following the disposition of the farm bill the motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary will be taken up, whether the committee acts favorably or unfavorably in reporting a bill. In view of the petition which was filed some time ago to discharge the committee, I believe Senators on both sides of the aisle are duty bound to the Senate and to the country to consider the displaced-persons bill before we adjourn.

Mr. CAIN. All I am asking is that the petition to discharge the committee be acted upon, rather than possibly have the committee report a bill against which several absent Senators obviously would vote were they present.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, if that practice were followed, probably there would never be a bill reported, because rarely is there a full attendance in committee during the consideration of any particular bill. I dare say that in over 10 percent of the cases every member of the committee was not present when measures were ordered reported. If we had had to wait until some Senator returned from overseas before we took up a bill in which he was interested, very few bills would have been considered during the past 3 or 4 months, because I can recall that from time to time during that period several Senators have been in Europe, studying different problems which were obviously very important to the Senate and the country; and I make no complaint about that. But if it is to be the rule that we must wait until every Senator is present, we might just as well forget about ever taking up a bill other than in the morning hour.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wish to make the observation that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] called me on Saturday just before he left for Mississippi unexpectedly because of the

illness resulting in the death of a member of his family. He expressed the hope that nothing would be done in regard to the displaced-persons legislation until he could return to Washington, and I am advised now that he expects to be here Thursday morning. He is making every effort to do so. I think the funeral is to be tomorrow, and the Senator from Mississippi will return Thursday morning, and I hope the bill will not be taken up in his absence. This is not the case of a Senator who is in Europe on an official mission, or on a mission of pleasure, or whatever the occasion might be. In this case a Member of the Senate is absent because of a circumstance which confronts all of us in life frequently, and it is something which the Senate should respect. I am sure every Senator would respect the request of the Senator from Mississippi because he is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, he has been very active in connection with the displaced-persons legislation, has a deep concern about it, and wants to be present if a motion is to be brought up to discharge the committee and to take up the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection has been made to the request of the Senator from Illinois.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may introduce bills and joint resolutions, present petitions and memorials, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OREGON SHEET METAL WORKS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Army, reporting, pursuant to law, on the claim of the Oregon Sheet Metal Works, wherein relief of \$25,000 was granted, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution to request the United States Civil Service Commission to grant to civil-service employees who served in Hawaii during the period of active hostilities in World War II preference rights equivalent to those granted to military and Navy personnel

"Whereas civil-service employees of the United States in Hawaii have been reduced in status or dismissed due to the operation of the civil-service laws and regulations relating to preferences for veterans in the Federal civil service; and

"Whereas many of these employees served in Hawaii during the period of active hostilities in World War II at a time when Hawaii was considered a combat zone for military purposes; and

"Whereas many of these employees were further required to remain in a civilian status and were not allowed to enter into

military or naval service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in special session assembled (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America, by law, and the United States Civil Service Commission, by rule or regulation, be and they are hereby respectfully requested to grant to civil-service employees of the United States who served in Hawaii during the period of active hostilities in World War II preference rights equivalent to those granted to military and Navy personnel for service at such times and place, in order that the service rendered in a combat zone by civilians may be recognized; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the United States Civil Service Commission."

A resolution adopted by the Foreman's Association of America, Detroit, Mich., favoring the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2404. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction, extension, and improvement of a county hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex., to provide facilities for the treatment of Indians; with amendments (Rept. No. 1146).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 4586. A bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands or any municipality thereof to issue bonds and other obligations; with amendments (Rept. No. 1152);

H. R. 4686. A bill to authorize the issuance of certain public-improvements bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1148);

H. R. 4968. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue flood-control bonds; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1149);

H. R. 5105. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1147);

H. R. 5459. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue bonds for the purpose of defraying the city and county's share of the cost of public improvements constructed pursuant to improvement district proceedings; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1150); and

H. R. 5490. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, to issue public-improvement bonds; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1151).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 3699. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize loans through national farm-loan associations in Puerto Rico; to modify the limitations on Federal land-bank loans to any one borrower; to repeal provisions for subscriptions to paid-in surplus of Federal land banks and cover the entire amount appropriated therefor into the surplus fund of the Treasury; to effect certain economies in reporting and recording payments on mortgages deposited with the registrars as bond collateral, and canceling the mortgage and satisfying and discharging the lien of record;

and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1144).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 5731. A bill to discharge a fiduciary obligation to Iran; without amendment (Rept. No. 1145).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 106. Resolution to give recognition to the Tercentenary Observance of the Maryland Act of Religious Tolerance passed in 1649; without amendment (Rept. No. 1153); and

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution relating to the holding in 1950 of the Dr. Thomas Walker Bicentennial Historical Pageant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1155).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 5319. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 40,029, relating to the badge of the Holy Name Society; without amendment (Rept. No. 1154).

EDUCATION OR TRAINING OF VETERANS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, the bill (S. 2596) relating to education or training of veterans under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., June 22, 1944), and I submit a report (No. 1156) thereon. The committee was unanimous in its recommendation that the bill pass.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and myself be added as additional cosponsors of the bill, S. 2596, just reported by me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and the request is granted.

WILDER DAM PROJECT REVIEW—ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 1077)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] I submit additional individual views by him on Senate Joint Resolution 58, providing for a rehearing in the matter of the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp. (Project No. 1892), known as the Wilder Dam project, and a review of any order of the Federal Power Commission therein.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The views will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing two nominations, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ugo Carusi, of Vermont, Edward M. O'Connor, of New York, and Harry N. Rosenfield, of New York, to be members of the Displaced Persons Commission;

John C. Pickett, of Wyoming, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, to fill a new position;

Herbert I. Hinds, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma, vice Granville T. Norris, term expired; and

Joseph A. McNamara, of Vermont, to be United States attorney for the district of Vermont.

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ben C. Connally, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas, to fill a new position; and

James V. Allred, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas, to fill a new position.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Timothy T. Cronin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin; and

Charles H. Cashin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Walter C. Lindley, of Illinois, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Sherman Minton, elevated; and

Casper Platt, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Illinois, vice Walter C. Lindley, elevated.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn M. Hrynjak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. GILLETTE introduced Senate bill 2656, to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce of injurious, misrepresented, and uninformatively labeled household cleansers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2657. A bill for the relief of Klaus W. Jonas and his wife, Ilse Bore Barkow Jonas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPMAN (for himself and Mr. WITHERS):

S. 2658. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2659. A bill for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2660. A bill to authorize the construction of a toll road in San Isabel National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DONNELL:

S. 2661. A bill for the relief of Victoria Zaharia Hillel; and

S. 2662. A bill for the relief of Evzen Syrovatka and his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2663. A bill to provide for the establishment of a ferry across the Powell River at or near Lead Mine Bend, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2664. A bill to provide that small business shall receive a fair share of Government procurements; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2665. A bill for the relief of Efstatheos Gasparis; and

S. 2666. A bill for the relief of Chang Fook (known as Chang Jack); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2667. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to limit importations of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2668. A bill to amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

S. 2669. A bill to increase the salaries of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the four remaining Commissioners, and the General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission; and

S. 2670. A bill to increase the compensation of members of the Board of Pardon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2671. A bill to ratify the administrative promotions of certain postal-service employees who were promoted upon return from military furlough; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to settle the claims arising out of the requisitioning of Finnish vessels by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LABELING OF CERTAIN HOUSEHOLD CLEANSERS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in the course of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee on the Utilization of Farm Crops information brought to the attention of the subcommittee indicated a need for the strengthening of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to cover soaps, detergents, and household cleansers. On a previous occasion I introduced S. 2392 to remove the exemption existing in the act in the case of soap. That bill would make soap subject to the same regulations in the Cosmetic Act as other skin cleansers.

At a later date, also on behalf of the subcommittee, I introduced S. 2531 which would place soaps and detergents under the labeling provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. That would cover the labeling of such soaps and detergents as are used in the home laundry, for washing dishes and which could not be classified as cosmetics or skin cleansers.

There are a great many other items in the soap and detergent class that should

be brought under the regulation of the Food and Drug Department, but which would not be covered by either S. 2392 or S. 2531. To accomplish this purpose of placing some control over labeling and ingredients going into the many cleansers sold and used in the household it seems necessary that a whole new piece of legislation be enacted. To that end I introduce for appropriate reference a further bill.

The bill (S. 2656) to prohibit the movement in interstate commerce of injurious, misrepresented, and uninformatively labeled household cleansers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GILLETTE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF FORMER SENATOR MILLER, OF IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 183), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed to arrange for and attend the funeral of Hon. BERT H. MILLER, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEMS

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. DONNELL) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 184), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized and directed through the Subcommittee on Health of the said committee to—

(a) Continue its study of the health problems of the Nation and of legislative proposals relating thereto which have been referred to the said subcommittee, which study shall be primarily concerned with ascertaining the full extent and nature of existing national health problems and the action, if any, which the Federal Government should take in relation to said problems;

(b) Consult, in the course of such study, with Federal agencies administering health and related programs, with such other legislative committees of the Senate as are concerned with related matters, and with such other agencies, organizations, or persons as the subcommittee may desire to consult;

(c) Report to the Senate not later than March 15, 1950, the results of the study, together with such proposed legislation, if any, and such other recommendations as the subcommittee may deem desirable.

Sec. 2. (a) The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through the said Subcommittee on Health, is authorized to sit and act at such times and in such places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such consultants, clerical, and other assistance; to procure such printing and binding; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures within the limits below set forth as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The expenses incurred under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Subsequently,

Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported without amendment Senate Resolution 184, supra, and submitted a report (No. 1157) thereon; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 185), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution No. 126, agreed to June 22, 1949.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2317) to authorize grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for planning State-wide programs of school construction; and to authorize grants for school construction, for advance planning of school facilities, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar as indicated:

H. R. 4390. An act to authorize the conveyance, for school purposes, of certain land in Acadia National Park to the town of Tremont, Maine, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6230. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to school district No. 5, Linn County, Oreg.; and

H. R. 6259. An act to provide for the installation of a carillon in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, Arlington National Cemetery, Fort Myer, Va., in memory of World War II dead; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to provide for additional appointments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 353. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion to preserve or dispose of material removed from the Executive Mansion during the period of renovation; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

PRICE SPREAD OF MILK—STATEMENT BY SENATOR GILLETTE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the price spread between what the farmer receives for milk and what the consumer pays, including a letter received by him from an Ohio dairyman on the subject, which appears in the Appendix.]

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," delivered by him on October 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR WILEY TO MEMORY OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him in tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN APPEAL FOR FUNDS FOR THE WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address in an appeal for funds for the Washington Cathedral, delivered by him at the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C., October 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF LELAND OLDS—TELEGRAM FROM GOVERNOR TUCK AND ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Governor Tuck, of Virginia, to William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, regarding the nomination of Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission, together with an article by Arthur Krock on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

POINT 4—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Your Money Back," published in the Washington Post of October 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHOULD MARSHALL PLAN MONEY BE USED TO BUY CANADIAN WHEAT?—ARTICLE BY GEORGE ROTHWELL BROWN

[Mr. SCHOEPEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an article entitled "Should Marshall Plan Money Be Used To Buy Canadian Wheat?" written by George Rothwell Brown and published in the Washington Times-Herald of October 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER AND ATOMIC ENERGY—MAJOR AMERICAN ISSUES—ARTICLE BY JUDSON KING

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Power and Atomic Energy—Major American Issues," written by Judson King, director, National Popular Government League, and published in the July-August 1949 issue of the Machinists' Monthly Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GRASS ROOTS ARE THE KEY TO ACTION IN AMERICA—EDITORIAL FROM THE MEXICO (MO.) LEDGER

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Grass Roots Are the Key to Action in America," from the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger of October 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF LELAND OLDS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Sham Battle," relating to the nomination of Leland Olds to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, published in the Washington Post of October 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ABOUT TWO GRADES OF JUSTICE—EDITORIAL FROM SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "About Two Grades of Justice," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of August 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HANDICAPS ON CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTIES—ARTICLE BY ROYCE BRIER

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Royce Brier in the San Francisco Chronicle dated September 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLANNED RIVER DEVELOPMENT—NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Planned River Development," published in the New York Times of Tuesday, August 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Sidney W. Lowery regarding the Fulbright student exchange program and a welcoming address by R. J. Cruikshank, editor of the London News-Chronicle, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED TAX ON IMPORTED COPPER—LETTER FROM GEORGE C. DELP

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from George C. Delp, president of the New Holland Machine Co., of New Holland, Pa., regarding the proposed import tax on copper, which appears in the Appendix.]

LELAND OLDS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Jerry Voorhis, executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, regarding the nomination of Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION OF MINNEAPOLIS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report of the Fair Employment Practice Commission of the city of Minneapolis for the period June 1, 1947, to June 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate after tomorrow.

Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week, beginning tomorrow.

NOMINATION OF LELAND OLDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in the Saturday's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, there appeared an editorial

entitled "Truman 'Puts on the Heat' for Olds."

Since the Olds nomination has become an issue involving an important constitutional principle, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks. Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that the editorial will be read by every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN "PUTS ON THE HEAT" FOR OLDS

President Truman's matter-of-fact admission that he has "put the heat" on Democratic Senators to force their support of his nomination of Leland Olds for a third term on the Federal Power Commission has serious complications that go far beyond this particular issue.

Truman has made the Olds appointment a matter of party loyalty and discipline. He wants Members of the Senate to surrender their constitutional right to reject a Presidential appointee, regardless of their opinion of the latter's fitness.

That means absolute party dominance over the individual. And if that is not the basic philosophy of fascism, what is?

The President has been stirred into this latest shoddy imitation of Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his whip-cracking phase, by the obvious disinclination of Democratic Senators to swallow the renaming of Olds. Truman is backing Olds because he believes the appointment of this radical would benefit him if and when he goes after the half-million leftist Labor Party votes in New York that were chalked up for Henry Wallace last year.

When the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, despite a preemptory letter from the President, voted to reject Olds by a vote of 10 to 2, with 5 Democrats joining 5 Republicans in opposition, Truman decided to take extraordinary measures. He got William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman of the Democratic National Committee, to telegraph all members of that committee and the officials of all Democratic State committees, urging them to warn their respective Senators that "the people want Olds confirmed."

Neither Truman nor Boyle, naturally, have asked the people whether they want Olds on the Commission. If they had, we are sure the answer would have displeased them.

Boyle made the reckless statement, also, in his pressure telegrams to the State leaders that Olds "has stood for what the Democratic Party has." In view of Olds' well-known radical background, this is an indictment of the Democratic Party, inflicted by its own national chairman, that may return to haunt it.

Truman, in the Olds case, is trying the old Roosevelt game of scaring Democrats in Congress into obedience under the implied threat of defeating them for reelection.

But even Roosevelt was not able to get away with that in the celebrated purge of 1938, when he declared war on all the Democratic Senators who opposed his Supreme Court packing bill. Roosevelt met defeat all down the line.

The Constitution provides, in the filling of specific Federal offices, that the President shall nominate and the appointment shall be made only with the consent of the Senate.

But Truman would leave to the members of his own party in the Senate no discretion in such matters. The Senators would merely be automatons, to acquiesce in whatever the party leadership ruled.

The case of Olds is one to strain party loyalty to the limit. He has a notorious radical background, with extreme views in favor of nationalization of industry and a record of left-wing political and journalistic affiliation.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democratic chairman of the Commerce Committee, in his reply to Truman's letter stated that the committee was "shocked beyond description of the political and economic views expressed by Olds some years ago" and that "We cannot believe that a person under our democratic capitalistic system holding such views is qualified to act in a quasi-judicial capacity in the regulation of industry."

Yet it is this man the President would ram down the throats of the Democratic Senators.

Says Truman: You have got to have party discipline to transact the business of government . . . A man selected on a party platform ought to carry it out.

Tuesday's vote in the Senate on the Olds appointment will show whether the Democratic Members are going to be cowed by Truman's decrepit take-off of Roosevelt as Congress' boss, or whether they are going to vote as they think. We hope and believe that they will not surrender their rights.

NOMINATION OF LELAND OLDS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared in regard to the nomination of Leland Olds to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, after sitting in hearings in subcommittee on the nomination of Mr. Leland Olds for reappointment to the Federal Power Commission, it amazes me that President Truman should have so nearly quoted a passage from the Communist Party membership book in explaining his support for Mr. Olds.

None of us had the opportunity to hear the exact words of President Truman in explaining his position at his press conference on Wednesday, October 5, but Arthur Krock, the eminent columnist for the New York Times, reported the conference in a manner which I am willing to believe is accurate.

During the course of the conference the reporters questioned Mr. Truman about the pressure messages of Democrat Chairman William M. Boyle, Jr., to members of his party throughout the Nation in which he demanded support of Mr. Olds.

Mr. Krock reports the repartee at the press conference went something like this: "Question. Isn't that the same as lobbying?"

Answer (by President Truman). Not necessarily. You have got to have party discipline to transact the business of government."

I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to this paragraph which appears in the membership books of the Communist Party in the United States:

"The strictest party discipline is the most solemn duty of all party members and all party organizations. The decisions of the Communist International and of all the leading bodies of the party must be promptly carried out."

I think the members of the party on the other side of the aisle (Democrat) probably have resented the similarity of the President's attitude in the Olds matter and the dictum of the Communist Party in the United States.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the parallel of Mr. Olds and the Communist philosophy did not begin with the President's press-conference explanation, nor will it end there.

Although President Truman's choice of party-discipline-above-national-good has attracted Nation-wide editorial comment of a nature most unfavorable to the President, I am inclined to believe that the recent editorials published in the Washington Post

and Washington Evening Star will suffice as reasonable examples and I hereby submit them for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

"[From the Washington Post of October 9, 1949]

"PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

"President Truman's comments about turning the heat on Members of Congress raise some far-reaching questions about our political system. Mr. Truman seems to think it is a simple matter of party discipline. Having nominated Mr. Leland Olds for a third term on the Federal Power Commission, and having encountered a rebuff from the Senate Commerce Committee, the President assumes he is justified in using the machinery of the Democratic Party in an effort to swing the Senate into line for his decision. Wholly aside from the merits of the case and of Mr. Olds' qualifications for the position, this maneuver seems to us a sorry distortion of party responsibility.

"The President might have asked himself first of all whether his attempt to discipline the Commerce Committee has any chance of being successful. In his press conference on Thursday he admitted that when Jim Farley turned the heat on him [Truman] as a Senator, in connection with the Barkley-Harrison fight for the party leadership, he ignored the White House request and honored his commitment to vote for Senator Harrison. All self-respecting Senators do likewise, unless the President's demands upon them happen to coincide with their own ideas. President Roosevelt's efforts to force the Court-packing bill down the throats of legislators by means of political pressure were a notorious failure. So was his attempted purge of legislators who resisted his demands.

"From the viewpoint of expediency, therefore, the President's tactics are not likely to change many votes. From the viewpoint of principle, moreover, they are wrong. Legislators would become mere puppets if they should surrender their right to make decisions of their own on policy issues that come before them. If the President were free to decide at any time that a policy he favors is a party matter, and if legislators belonging to the party represented by the President were then under obligation to fall into line with his request, we should have dictatorship rather than party responsibility.

"To our mind party responsibility has a very different meaning. It indicates that a group of leaders in both the executive and legislative branches work together to formulate a party policy which all can and will support. Decisions of this group can then be presented with a united front and command party-wide support because they reflect a meeting of minds among the leaders who have come to the top in the party's councils. The caucus can be used to bind party members to the support of decisions taken by this means, and any rebellion against such decisions by individual legislators can be reasonably treated as party treason.

"But this sort of party responsibility, which comes of discussion and cohesion among a substantial group of party leaders, is totally different from an attempt on the part of the President to impose his will upon Congress when no party policy in any accepted meaning of the word has been established. It seems to us that the President has slipped into a dictatorial attitude that will not only injure the worthy cause that he is espousing but is likely also to bedevil his relationship with Congress on many other issues."

"[From the Evening Star of October 8, 1949]

"BULLDOZING THE SENATE

"President Truman is singularly inept in his efforts to secure Senate approval of

Leland Olds for a third term on the Federal Power Commission.

"He began by writing a letter to the committee considering the nomination. The letter implied that unless the committee approved the nomination it would be playing into the hands of selfish corporate interests.

"Then he instructed the Democratic national chairman, William M. Boyle, Jr., to appeal to State political bosses to put the heat on the Senate. The State leaders were told to let the Senators know that "the people want Olds confirmed." It would be hard to think of anything sillier. The chances are that 98 percent of the people had never heard of Mr. Olds until this week, and it is a cinch that 99 percent have not the foggiest notion whether he has been a good, bad, or indifferent member of the Power Commission.

"Finally, the President personally undertakes to make the issue one of party regularity. He claims for himself the power to determine that some question—the nomination of Mr. Olds, for instance—is a party matter. And once that determination has been made, he says, the Democratic Senators are expected to fall into line and vote as they are told to vote. Never mind that the Senators take an oath to support the Constitution, and that the Constitution contemplates that they will exercise their own independent judgment in voting for or against a nominee. Skip the fact that the President, in effect, is demanding that Senators vote contrary to their convictions and without regard for what they may sincerely believe to be best for the country. When the partisan whip is cracked, they are expected to toe the line.

"It can be argued, with truth, that there is need for some party discipline. It is also true that this is not the first time, nor will it be the last time, that party bosses have tried to bulldoze one or both branches of Congress. But when, in a matter of this kind, a President goes to the lengths to which Mr. Truman has gone he deserves a figurative rap on the knuckles. And that probably is just what Mr. Truman will get from the Senate."

The gentlemen who wrote these editorials not only frowned upon President Truman's newest effort to become not only the administrative but the legislative branch of the Government, but they also were quite aware that newspaper accounts of the subcommittee hearings were accurate in describing Mr. Olds' philosophy of Government.

The witness, Congressman JOHN E. LYLE, a Democrat from Texas, set forth 25 points of Mr. Olds' thinking. Briefing them still further for sake of clarity, we find the 25 points as follows:

1. He urged comrades to enroll in Communist training courses.
2. Claimed educational institutions are subservient to money princes.
3. Hailed the decay of the church.
4. Advocated elimination of private property and nationalization of railroads, public utilities, and coal.
5. Called Fourth of July as the day set apart by the world's greatest exploiters to glorify their rise to power.
6. Revealed fundamental opposition to private enterprise system.
7. Denounced private enterprise system.
8. Exulted over decay of capitalist system.
9. Urged downfall of American system.
10. Predicts passing of capitalism.
11. Hailed fatal illness of profit system.
12. Predicted dire consequences unless profit system is superseded.
13. Foresees elimination of competitive private capitalism.
14. Looks forward to planned economic order.
15. Expresses contempt for major political parties.
16. Asserted that political democracy based on geographical representation is played out.

17. Contended that confusion of thinking arises when social revolution is conceived as an extension of democracy.

18. Extols the virtues of the Russian system as against conditions in the United States.

19. Commended Lenin for knowing what would take the place of political partyism.

20. Enthused that in Russia the labor movement leads the world in building a workers' republic.

21. Urged, in conformity with Marxian doctrine, the establishment of a new world unity of workers.

22. Laments the failure of American labor to join with Russian unions.

23. Praised the Russian system as the coming world order.

24. Preached class war.

25. Echoes the Communist doctrines of class struggle as proclaimed by Karl Marx.

As Congressman LYLE testified, these points of Mr. Olds' philosophy as represented in the former Commissioner's writings, some of which were published in the Communist Daily Worker, show unmistakably that Mr. Olds' objectives were basically hostile to our American way of life.

Nevertheless, Mr. William M. Boyle, Jr., Democratic national chairman, saw fit to say that Federal Power Commissioner Olds has stood for what the Democratic Party has stood.

Mr. Boyle made this evaluation of Mr. Olds' philosophy in telegraphic messages which he sent to Democratic Party leaders throughout the Nation in an effort to enforce the party discipline above national good about which Mr. Truman commented in the afore-mentioned press conference.

One might think that Mr. Boyle could be excused for such flamboyant disregard for the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson because he had not attended the subcommittee hearings, or perhaps had not so much as read a newspaper.

However, when the learned men of the press who also had not attended the subcommittee meetings find it possible to be so unerringly right in their evaluation of Mr. Olds' thinking, then it is to be assumed that Mr. Boyle, who has access to the same source of information, is attempting to formulate a new party line.

The same could be said here of President Truman, but it really isn't necessary, because it was said by inference and very effectively by a member of his own party, the esteemed chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, EDWIN C. JOHNSON, in a letter which Senator JOHNSON sent to President Truman on October 4.

Now, keep in mind that October 4 President Truman received Senator JOHNSON's letter by special messenger, and yet on October 5, the very next day, Mr. Truman sent a disciplinary warning to his party members.

Mr. Truman was not without proper information about Mr. Olds even if he waited until Senator JOHNSON's letter arrived before trying to find out anything about him. Senator JOHNSON's letter said:

"The subcommittee was shocked beyond description by the political and economic views expressed by Mr. Olds some years ago. We cannot believe that a person under our democratic capitalistic system holding such views is qualified to act in a quasi-judicial capacity in the regulation of industry."

This was pretty plain talk and could not possibly have been of such magnitude as to have been beyond the understanding powers of the President.

Senator JOHNSON was quite lenient with the President's responsibility in such important matters when he wrote in the letter:

"I feel very certain these radical views have never been brought to your attention, and I will therefore include herewith a few excerpts."

Then Senator JOHNSON inserted in his letter to the President the following excerpts from the writings of Mr. Olds for the Federated Press, whose dispatches were carried by the Daily Worker:

"Capitalism in the United States is rapidly passing into the stage which has marked the decay of many earlier social orders, the stage in which a dominant owning class ceases to perform a function in the business of society."

"The owners exist only, a privileged class of parasites whose idleness and dissipation become an increasing stench in the nostrils of the people." (Leland Olds, Federated Press, Labor Letter, January 24, 1929, p. 1.)

"The manipulation of democratic institutions by this wealthy autocracy forces labor to seek other than constitutional processes." (Leland Olds, Federated Press, Labor Letter, May 11, 1927, p. 1.)

"Here is certainly a breach which may widen until the sanctity of private property in the capitalist sense follows the divine right of kings into discard. Inevitable changes in the economic organizations of society are exposing it as just another myth preached in the interest of a small class seeking to retain power and privilege." (Leland Olds, Federated Press, Labor Letter, July 28, 1927, p. 1.)

"The opposition of the United Mine Workers to competitive wages can only be made effective through the elimination of competitive private capitalism. The miners have two alternatives—to develop, along with the rest of organized labor, political power sufficient to put over nationalization, or to seek control by the workers themselves under a worker government." (Leland Olds, Federated Press, Labor Letter, April 6, 1927.)

"Lenin knew what would take the place of political partyism when he made his bid for power in Russia with the slogan 'All power to the Soviets.' * * * That change is coming in America. Under labor's advance preparation will depend its share in the new apportionment of authority." (Leland Olds, Federated Press, Labor Letter, November 11, 1925.)

"To millions of workers slaving throughout the world to provide the tribute enacted by the American dollar empire the Fourth of July will loom as anything but the birthday of liberty. They will view it as the day set apart by the world's greatest exploiters to glorify their rise to power." (Leland Olds, Federated Press, the Daily Worker, July 5, 1928.)

I think the next to the last paragraph of his letter was Senator JOHNSON's very loyal and last attempt to excuse his Chief Executive's apparent ignorance of the facts about Mr. Olds.

Senator JOHNSON said in that paragraph: "The committee found Mr. Olds glib of tongue and very convincing. Like many crusaders for foreign ideologies he has an attractive personality and is disarming to a very high degree."

This constituted the major portion of Senator JOHNSON's reply to President Truman's letter of October 3 to Senator JOHNSON in support of Mr. Olds.

President Truman displayed his lack of knowledge of what had been said and proved of Mr. Olds' past before the committee when, in his letter to Senator JOHNSON, the President wrote:

"Nothing has been presented in testimony there which raises any doubt in my mind as to his integrity, loyalty, or ability."

Yet, after reading Senator JOHNSON's letter—and it is presumed the President did read it—the next day he continued to talk in favor of Mr. Olds.

It is hard to believe that any American could have any doubt about Mr. Olds' philosophy of government after reading Senator JOHNSON's letter to the President, or hearing the testimony against him.

In the face of all this evidence—and much, much more on the pages of the committee transcript—it doesn't seem quite logical that this matter should be determined on the basis of party discipline.

I believe it is quite clear that the country's good is a principle here that far overshadows any partisan considerations.

I am hopeful that Senators on both sides of the aisle will join me in voting against the nomination of Mr. Olds.

FARM LEGISLATION—LETTER FROM J. BLEEKER TO SENATOR YOUNG

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I received a letter from a farmer of Coatesville, Pa., named J. Bleeker. It contained an excellent statement and analysis of the farm-price support proposal now pending in Congress. I wish to commend this farmer for his excellent and straight thinking on agricultural matters. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG:

We are amazed that the Senators can't see the fundamentals for the details. All the discussion of farm bills is on details, minor points, how much of this or that, but only casually and briefly, as of small importance, are fundamentals even mentioned. The delays are not worth the difference. If necessary, pass a bill leaving details to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, but do it quickly. Then the following year's experience will suggest needed modifications. And time will be available to pass the overdue social security bill without quibble from either side, as both have promised it.

In the first place, the farm problem is not a farm problem, it is a depression problem, and it concerns chiefly 5,000,000 farm families and 10,000,000 families of industrial workers. Why? Because the condition of farming over which the individual farmer has no control, have, beginning with the depression of 1828, started the downward spiral which resulted in our major depressions. At that time President Jackson aptly commented: "The predicament of the farmers toppled the first domino." Obviously the industrial workers whose families suffer during a depression, would, if they were aware of the above fact, insist on action to maintain farm-family buying power. When farmers stop buying industrial products, industrial workers are laid off, and then they cannot buy industrial products, more industrial workers are laid off, and the cumulative effect results in a major depression. We need go no farther back than 1928 to cite an outstanding example of this historic fact.

Secondly, why do farm families lose their buying power right at the height of production? Because of two facts, one historic, the other economic. The historic fact is that farm-prices received start falling before industrial prices. Example: farm prices received began falling in mid-1947, but the prices the farmer must pay have remained level or have risen. (A few months ago the price of 40-quart milk cans rose in Coatesville from \$10.75 to \$11.80.) This loss of net income means loss of ability to buy industrial products, unemployment of industrial workers began and reached 4,000,000 before seasonal and other factors reversed the trend, but the underlying fundamental persists, though obscured by strikes, and will topple us in a 1950's depression probably out-rivalling that of the 1930's, unless prevented by act of Congress. This is the economic factor referred to above: Industries operate on a backlog of orders at agreed-upon prices, and

of materials supply in hand or under contract. Without such support from the markets the industrial plants cease operation. But the farmer has no backlog of orders, and knows not what production, prices, and demand will be at harvest time, and he can't shut down his plant. So, when prices he receives start falling, he must plant more, which makes prices go still lower. This is a cumulative effect which historically has accelerated the squeeze on farmer buying.

Why can't farmers get together to control production and so to control farm prices received? Another historic fact is the answer: they have tried to do so but a 10 percent of chisellers were enough to cause defeat. Example: the Kentucky "night riders" of 50 years ago. Only a combination of Federal support and adequate incentive can succeed.

Stated in a few words, the farm problem is a problem of preventing depressions, and a solution is important to some 15,000,000 families.

Specifically, the problem is to maintain the buying power of some 5,000,000 farm families entirely dependent on operation of family-size farms for income. Get the point: only farm-operating families should receive support. The immediate means are controls of farm production of and bonuses for staples. The farm must be the sole means of support for a farm-operating family. This eliminates absentee landlords, and takes care of large holdings divided amongst tenant families. Renters would receive total support, share croppers only on their share of the crop. Small pieces of land operated as an avocation or as additional means of support would be eliminated. The criterion would be sole support for a farm-operating family.

Because of human nature, and gradations of intelligence, production limitation should be optional to each farm family. Mandatory controls enforced by fines result in too much bitterness, argumentation, and friction. Votes should not be taken: the losers are bound to feel resentful and imposed upon, and fines produce permanent scars. With a properly based plan of control, and adequate incentive, voluntary cooperation will be assured. Hold-outs will soon see their errors of judgment.

The basis for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, etc., should be acreage, and payments should depend not on measured production, but on average production for an area. This basis of acreage and average production, would require the lowest cost of administration. Field men, properly chosen, are excellent judges of field size, fields in general remain the same in size year after year, county controls have maps from which checks can and should be made, the Government need not store, payments are simply calculated or read from acreage tables. Services of field men, disputes, office expense, and favoritism are minimized. The farmer could store, or sell at open-market prices. The basis of payment would be determined by the average of open-market prices in a given area at time of harvest. The criterion of amount of support should be to give, say to a wheat farmer, a net income equal to that of an industrial worker of equivalent responsibility. Simple in the extreme. There would be no lack of incentive to intensify, and careless farming would punish itself.

Mixed farming on family-size farms would be handled automatically by the above plan. Consider a farmer who sells whole milk and some grain for cash income. To the extent that he sells grain, he is a grain farmer and receives pro rata support. To the extent that he sells whole milk he is a dairy farmer and comes under the Federal milk-price control. In adjusting acreage limitation for a dairy farmer on a covered grain crop, he would be allowed so many acres to be fed on his farm, and then a limit be specified

for excess which he would sell and on which support would be paid. If he keeps other animals, similar adjustment would be made. There would exist the possibility that a farmer would claim a covered crop to be fed, and an uncovered crop to be sold, to influence adjustment, and later do a vice versa, but a qualified field man would discover the trick sooner or later, and a penalty in the form of no allowance for fed acreage of the covered crop would deter such chiseling in general.

By the above simple plan, production of staples can be limited to adequate and safe carry-over, open-market prices would be maintained at a real-value level, total cost of support would be minimized, a safe net income of farm families would be maintained with consequent avoidance of farm-induced depressions, all accomplished with a minimum cost of administration of support.

We confess that we farmers are on the whole ignorant of legal lingo and politics, that we are misled by self-anointed farm leaders (?), but it pains us greatly to read reams of congressional blah-blah which skims over fundamentals, gets nowhere, and even admits jokers like the storage limitation of the Eightieth Congress intended to sabotage the whole idea. For ignorant as we are, we realize fully that the big industrial leaders largely control Government, are interested in low cost of living for their workers regardless of farm bankruptcies, and worry now about depressions except when they think of the Bastille of 1789.

It appears to us that Secretary Brannan has the aim of this plan—the family-size farm—but gets lost in a fog of details and consequent complexity. We would suggest that Senators who have had no great experience as responsible operators of family-size farms as sole support for their families, should not waste the time of the Senate by speaking on this subject from the floor. Design of a support plan should be left to Senators and others who have had plenty of such experience.

J. BLEEKER.

COATESVILLE, PA., October 7, 1949.

STABILIZATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on page 16, line 16, of the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that the preliminaries are out of the way, and we are engaged in consideration of the farm bill, I should like to ask the majority leader if it is his intention, in the event the farm bill is not completed this afternoon, to have a night session? Several Senators have asked me that question. I thought possibly the majority leader would like to answer.

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to answer the question and advise my good friend from Nebraska that there will be no night session.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hesitate to take up much more time of the Senate, but by reason of the fact that last Friday, when the amendment was being discussed, several Senators were not present on the floor who are now present, I want to take this opportunity, hoping I do not abuse the privilege by taking too much time, to explain what the amendment is, so that Senators will understand it.

There was some discussion last Friday regarding whether or not the language of the amendment was sufficiently clear so that it was susceptible of a complete understanding. I said at that time that I did not know how one could set forth more plainly in the English language the intent of the amendment, and I still say so after having explored the possibility, over the week end, that we might make the language of the amendment more clear. It has been suggested humorously that if I couch the amendment in an English accent perhaps the State Department may more completely understand it, but we are still dealing with the American language.

This is what the amendment does. Section 22, which is now the law of the land, and has been the avowed policy of the Government and the Congress since the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1948, provides in effect that when certain agricultural commodities being imported under trade agreements or otherwise reach a point where they may jeopardize either a price-support program or an agricultural product in short supply, or an agricultural product under control by the terms of the act, then the President of the United States shall do certain things.

First, he shall ask for a fact-finding board and give public notice of hearings. He shall consult with the Secretary of Agriculture, who knows the subject. He shall then consult with the Tariff Commission, and the facts will be presented to him. If, after the presentation of the facts he finds that the importation of certain agricultural commodities is seriously affecting the market, the price support, or the controls with respect to any mandatory provisions set forth in the Agricultural Act, he then shall have permissive authority to set import fees of a temporary nature which will help our domestic situation. That is the law of the land.

Also in section 22 of the act, paragraph (f) reads as follows:

No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.

In other words, we set an agricultural policy. We set it for a very good and meritorious reason. We say that when a product is controlled, either by price support or otherwise under the terms of the act, the President shall have the right temporarily to protect it by doing certain things if the facts justify it. But we also say, in paragraph (f), that the State Department may make any agreement in contravention of this section. In other words, it may completely nullify it if it wishes to do so. All my amendment does, in plain English, is to reverse that policy. It provides as follows:

No international agreement hereafter shall be entered into by the United States, or renewed, extended, or allowed to extend beyond its permissible termination date in convention of this section.

In simple terms, it says to the State Department, "You shall not make international trade agreements in violation

of law." That is all it does. This act is the law. Either we must repeal section 22, which after long hearings the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate thought would be necessary, or we must change the policy. The effect has been that in many instances the State Department has entered into trade agreements with other countries in direct contravention of this section.

Several farm organizations, appreciating the need for this amendment in order to maintain a stable agricultural economy in this country, since they have become conscious of the amendment, and previous to this, in connection with the reciprocal trade agreements debate, have sent telegrams to Members of the Senate.

I shall read several of the telegrams:

OCTOBER 10, 1949.

On behalf our members we urge passage of Magnuson amendment to revised farm bill S. 2522, in order to authorize protection of support price structure against nullifying imports. We believe it illogical to undertake farm price supports by one law and make it possible to completely or partially neutralize price supports by another.

JOHN H. DAVIS,

Executive Secretary, National Council of Farm Cooperatives.

(Sent to Senators GEORGE D. AIKEN, SCOTT W. LUCAS, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, CLYDE R. HOEY, JAMES P. KEM, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, PAUL DOUGLAS, ERNEST W. McFARLAND, DENNIS CHAVEZ, HARLEY M. KILGORE, MATTHEW M. NEELY, HARRY FLOOD BYRD, HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., CARL HAYDEN, LESTER C. HUNT, PAT McCARRAN, JAMES E. MURRAY, ELBERT D. THOMAS, HERBERT R. O'CONNOR, GUY M. GILLETTE, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, FRANCIS J. MYERS, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, GLEN H. TAYLOR, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 8, 1949.

Urge support of Magnuson amendment to farm bill because without some such provision entire price-support program on many commodities could be nullified by occasional or unlimited imports. Any farm program to be effective must be protected if it is to work.

ALBERT S. GOSS,
National Grange.

(Sent to: All members Agricultural Committee and Senators CHAVEZ, KILGORE, NEELY, BYRD, LODGE, DOUGLAS, ELLENDER, HAYDEN, McFARLAND, HUNT, McCARRAN, MCCLELLAN, MURRAY, MYERS, GEORGE, RUSSELL, TAYLOR, THOMAS of Utah, O'CONNOR, GILLETTE.)

DENVER, COLO., October 10, 1949.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Agriculture Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Agricultural industry increasingly alarmed over developments relative to tariff matters. The new trade agreement just announced with further cuts, the failure to include the peril point in the extension of the reciprocal trade act makes it seem tremendously important to do the one thing that remains left at this session that will be of help, namely, to support the Magnuson amendment to section 22 of the AAA Act. Hope you are in a position to do this.
AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,
F. E. MOLLIN, *Executive Secretary.*

OCTOBER 10, 1949.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D. C.:

Present interpretation of subsection (f) of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act nullifies intent of Congress. Unless such

interpretation is changed Government is powerless to protect agricultural programs, including price-support programs, against unlimited importation of agricultural commodities. We respectfully urge your support of Magnuson amendment to Anderson bill S. 2522 which proposes to clarify congressional intent concerning this subject.

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

(Sent to Senators ELMER THOMAS (Okla.), ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SCOTT W. LUCAS, CLYDE R. HOEY, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, SPOFFORD L. HOLLAND, GUY M. GILLETTE, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, GEORGE D. AIKEN, MILTON R. YOUNG, EDWARD J. THYE, JAMES P. KEM, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

I know of no farm organization which opposes this amendment. It does not affect the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It does not affect the reciprocal-trade program, because it is the law of the land. Those who negotiate trade agreements should be put on notice, and it is only fair to the other countries to know that section 22 is a part of our law.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator stated that he knows of no farm organization which opposes the amendment. Is that true of the National Farmers Union?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no communication from the Farmers Union in support of the amendment, but most of the other organizations have sent me communications in support of the amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Did the Senator include the American Farm Bureau Federation in the group supporting the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation, but it was directed to this question when we discussed it informally in relation to my amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. So I could not categorically state what their position is on an amendment to the agricultural bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator have any communication from them opposing the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I have none. All farm organizations have been put on sufficient notice as to this proposal.

A great deal was said on Friday in opposition to this amendment, to the effect that the amendment would make necessary the renegotiation of all our trade agreements. I contend that that is not true. I do not think that would be required. I wish briefly to state my reasons why.

The Magnuson amendment to the farm bill would not and could not require the renegotiation of the Geneva agreement or any other trade agreement that was properly drawn in the first place.

The proof of this is simple and to the point. Paragraph (f) of section 22 of the AAA Act was adopted after the Geneva agreement was signed. Neither that agreement nor any other agreement could legally interfere with any section

22 program. Trade agreements are executive agreements, whereas section 22 was an act of Congress signed by the President and takes precedence over any executive agreement. What is the use of enacting laws if laws do not take precedence over executive agreements.

Paragraph (f) of section 22 was only adopted in 1948. Therefore, it could not have created any obligation on the part of the signatories of any trade agreement that did not already exist. No trade agreement has become effective since paragraph (f) of section 22 was adopted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Would section 22 cover not only grain, but cattle?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; all agricultural products.

Therefore the changing of section 22 (f), or even its complete abolishment or its replacement, could not have any legal or moral effect on any international agreement made prior to its adoption. There was no obligation to any country to change section 22—every agreement made had to be, and was, subject to the terms of existing United States law. After the trade agreement was signed and became effective changes in United States agricultural laws could not create any obligation under the terms of that agreement. Furthermore, neither the President nor the State Department had authority under the trade-agreement law, or otherwise, to promise that Congress would alter existing agricultural laws.

If adoption of the Magnuson amendment requires renegotiation of any trade agreement, then that same agreement would have had to be renegotiated anyway because the Magnuson proposal is an amendment to section 22 (f), a section which did not exist when any trade agreement was signed.

On February 25, 1949, Mr. Winthrop Brown, testifying for the State Department before the Senate Finance Committee, made the flat statement that the Geneva agreement contained nothing that would limit the power to put into effect section 22. Mr. Brown was quoted last Friday as being opposed to this section. I hope the Senators from Georgia and Arkansas will note that the man who was quoted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], Mr. Winthrop Brown, in testifying for the State Department before the Senate Finance Committee, made the flat statement that the Geneva agreement contained nothing which would limit the power to put into effect section 22. He did state that an absolute embargo would conflict with the spirit of the Geneva agreement, but neither section 22 nor the Magnuson amendment contemplate or permit embargoes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me complete this thought.

I refer to pages 1223 and 1224 of the hearings on H. R. 1211 before the Senate Finance Committee. It is interesting to note—page 1224—that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] agreed with Mr. Brown, as I interpret his statement. I

have the colloquy before me, and if Senators wish to have me read it, I shall be glad to do so.

Section 22 does not permit the imposition of absolute embargoes. It should also be noted that Mr. Brown's recent statements that some agreements would need to be renegotiated if the Magnuson amendment is adopted were not supported by any evidence. As a matter of fact he did not actually make the statement, but he did leave that impression. This was in February 1949, after the Agricultural Act of 1948 had been enacted.

In short, any agreement that was made in contravention of existing United States laws was not legal; and the adoption of paragraph (f) to section 22 could not have created any legal aura that was missing, for if the original agreement was made in excess of existing authority, then the commitments were not binding.

Mr. President, this amendment merely indicates the intent of this Congress to give the laws which it makes precedence over State Department international agreements. That is the law. This amendment merely clarifies the congressional intent.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the examination of Mr. Brown by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], appearing at page 1223 of the hearings on the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, held in February and March of 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything in this article, Mr. Brown, referring now to the general agreements and not to the provision in the Canadian trade agreements, because the Canadian trade agreement obviously would not, which would conflict with the provision, for instance, in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir. It would have an effect on the administration of that act, but it would not affect the act itself or the authority conferred by the act.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what do you mean by "administration of that act"? Under that section 22, the President himself is authorized to take steps which will prevent the negation of an act of the Congress as, for instance, in the field of agricultural production.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct, sir. And it is the purpose of this exception to permit him to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the purpose of this to permit that?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And it would not operate to prevent it or to restrict or limit the power, would it?

Mr. BROWN. It would not prevent him from preventing the frustration of a program imposed under or put into effect under section 22.

The CHAIRMAN. I just wanted to get your view on that point.

Senator MILLIKIN. Do you understand, Mr. Chairman, that the President would have authority to put a quota into effect to prevent the frustration?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes. Or a limited quota, or restrictions of some sort. Yes. He has done so.

Senator MILLIKIN. That is my impression.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true, is it not, Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The President has imposed limited quotas, at least. I do not know of any instance in which he has put an absolute embargo on and stopped all importations, even though the agricultural program might have been suffering somewhat. But he has taken steps.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that is about all I have to say regarding this amendment. I seriously plead with the Senate that either we should clarify this matter so that the State Department cannot make agreements in contravention of existing law, or else we should repeal the section which, in my opinion, was for the protection of American agriculture, and was arrived at not only after long and careful discussions and hearings, on the part of the committees, but after careful consideration on the part of the Congress of the United States itself.

RECOGNITION OF SOVIET REGIME IN CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments to discuss the question of recognition of the Soviet regime in China.

It is my belief that recognition will not solve any problem. The next logical step to recognition of that country, with which the Congress would be confronted, would be the question of trade with the Communist regime in that country. Later, we would be told that such moves were not sufficient and there would be involved a question of financing the trade to Communist China. When that had been completed, we would be told that these moves were not a sufficient gesture of good will toward the people of that new Communist satellite, and that it would therefore be necessary for us to offer them ECA aid. If we follow the whole silly cycle, I suppose that in a short period of time it would be suggested that in order not to discriminate against the satellite powers, we should bring them in under the military-assistance program.

Mr. President, the question of recognition is one which I think is of great concern to the American Congress and to the American people. I do not believe the citizens of the United States can for long be sold a bill of goods that it is important to maintain a free world of free men by keeping 240,000,000 western Europeans outside the iron curtain, while simultaneously the Government of the United States is following a policy of giving aid and comfort to the spread of communism in Asia.

Mr. President, I recognize the fact that the British Government and the British people perhaps have great investments in the Far East. I recognize that there may be some pressures on the part of business groups for recognition. I merely wish to call to the attention of His Majesty's Government, as well as to the attention of the people of Britain and to the attention of the people of the United States, the fact that when the British Government first recognized the Soviet Union it was done with the purpose in view that by such recognition of the Soviet Union, British investments in the Soviet Union would be somewhat safe-

guarded or at least salvaged in part. Of course, the cold, hard facts of history are that there was no salvage of British investments in the Soviet Union as a result of Britain's recognition of that government. It is my judgment that history will point out very clearly that there will be no salvage of British investments in Communist China if the Communist regime in China is recognized. Communism has no respect for private property. It will tolerate it while it awaits a better time to digest it.

But, Mr. President, the matter has even more important implications than that. There were business groups in the United States, as well as in Britain, who thought they could do business with Hitler, who thought they could do business with the warlords of Japan. Some of the scrap iron and oil Americans sold to Japan in the days prior to Pearl Harbor came back on us on the morning of December 7, 1941, and some of the British businessmen who thought they could do business with Hitler, and supplied Nazi Germany with machine tools and other equipment, found that equipment had been used to help fortify Nazi Germany, and some of the products of that equipment came back on them during the blitz on London and during the other air raids on Britain.

Mr. President, the Senate has a tremendous responsibility in the field of foreign relations. I do not believe the American Government necessarily has to follow a policy of recognizing, either de facto or de jure, another government merely because it has overrun by force of arms a major area of a legal government which is still functioning. To the contrary, President Woodrow Wilson clearly indicated in at least one of the Mexican revolutions, where the government of Francisco Madero had been overthrown by force and violence and the President assassinated, that the government which succeeded it was not a legal government and that, despite the fact that government then held de facto power, it was not entitled to de jure or de facto recognition. Later Secretary Stimson in his nonrecognition policy in regard to Manchuria, clearly indicated that merely because a government had established de facto power, as had the Japanese puppet government in Manchuria, that was no reason at all why the Government of the United States should give its blessing to any such government.

Mr. President, it is a fallacy to believe that there is any basis at this time or in the immediate future for the recognition of the Communist regime in China. They have had no free elections. They have an absolute dictatorship. We have only to read the proclamations of the new Communist constitution and the statements of Mao Tze-tung and the other leaders of the Communist movement, to know that it has no claim of validity or legality as being the action of the Chinese people themselves; but, rather, it is a government which has been established by force of arms over a part of China.

Furthermore, Mr. President, despite the dark days through which the Government of China is now passing, the legally recognized Government of that

country still controls an area which is of the approximate geographic size of the United States of America; and still outside the Communist orbit are approximately 150,000,000 people of China, or a population approximating that of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a number of articles and editorials. I shall take the time of the Senate to read only one of them. It is a very able editorial which appeared yesterday in the New York Times, one of the leading newspapers, if not the leading newspaper, in the United States. I wish to read it to the Senate. It appears under the heading "China's double ten."

CHINA'S "DOUBLE TEN"

The tenth day of the tenth month has been celebrated in China since 1911 as National Emancipation Day. It is the anniversary of the start of the successful revolution against the Manchu dynasty led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. Its theme has always been liberation from a regime regarded as wrong politically and as essentially alien.

It is tragic and ironic that those Chinese who are still free, and their American friends, must observe the day this year in the shadow of the conquest of a large part of China by another regime that is essentially both wrong and alien. Presumably there will also be some observation of the day in Communist-dominated areas where the Red Army is called the army of liberation. But the very use of the word "liberation" by a regime that has already pledged its fealty to a foreign state and the idea of celebrating "emancipation" in an area that has been newly enslaved are mockery and travesty.

Chiang Kai-shek, in his message of the day, has declared that China has been subjected to a new alien aggression more treacherous and deadly than the last. He has once more appealed to us, if indirectly, for whatever assistance we can give to aid in stemming that tide of aggression so that China may once more be free. Such an appeal has a poignancy that cannot be ignored. It must cause us to question, once more, if we have done all that we could have done.

There has been a widespread tendency, particularly in some State Department circles, to reduce our Chinese policy to what are called the "practical realities" of the situation. We are urged carefully to assess what use would be made of help that we could give and to weigh and decide, in advance, if such help would be sufficient from the outside to turn the tide. On Double Ten Day such an attitude seems needlessly cold-blooded. We can at the very least make it plain that we support the Nationalist Government of China and that we do not propose to traffic with the aggressor. Dr. Sun made no practical appraisal when he set China on the road to liberty. He believed freedom could not be compromised.

We shall have to answer to our own consciences and to history if we sacrifice principle to expediency. We also will be weighed when it is asked how deep was our devotion to freedom, how firm our loyalty to our friends who wish to be free. Double Ten Day, today, is a grim day for China. It ought to be a solemn day for us in the United States.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, another of the great newspapers of the country, under the heading "The Red future in China"; an article by Mr. Raymond Lawrence, which appeared in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, October 5, 1949, entitled "Recogni-

tion the Way To Seal China's Fate"; and an article written by Victor Riesel, which appeared under date of October 3, from which I want to read two paragraphs. In discussing the American Federation of Labor's convention at St. Paul, he says:

First off, leaders of the A. F. of L.'s powerful 8,000,000 members bluntly assert that the United States Department was responsible for the Chinese Communists' new Central Government.

"The Far Eastern Division of the State Department seemed to favor the Communist cause in China and used its influence to prevent Congress from voting further aid to the Nationalist (Chiang) Government," the A. F. of L. chiefs here charge officially and angrily in their report to the convention—where most delegates represent a powerful union.

I ask that the entire article be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and the two articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of October 11, 1949]

THE RED FUTURE IN CHINA

During the past few months, following the Communist victories in the Yangtze Valley, there have been few indications of any development of Titoism in China. The Chinese Reds have been loud in their protestations of love for Moscow. (They have been so loud, indeed, that some observers believe they have been trying to allay suspicions in the Kremlin.) The new constitution of Communist China, broadcast on the Red radio, provides for a centralized dictatorship on the Communist pattern. Little has occurred to indicate that the Communist leaders in China, although they won control of large areas of their country with comparatively little help from the Soviet Union, plan to deviate from whatever party line is issued in Moscow. The Chinese Reds have won their own victory but also have enslaved their own minds.

It seems difficult to explain their intense allegiance to the Soviet Union. Reaction to American support of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek over a period of years presumably is part of the explanation but does not appear to be a complete one. Whatever the cause, at any rate, the phenomenon is highly interesting because it holds implications for the future of China. There is a strong possibility that the more the Chinese Communists persist in being thoroughly Red the weaker will be their hold on the Chinese people.

China does not resemble the Soviet Union and is not like the Communist countries of eastern Europe. It is an agrarian country with few mineral resources and has an economy based on subsistence agriculture. Neither food production nor the welfare of the peasants could be improved materially by collective farming. There is no industrial proletariat except in a few cities. Because of this situation Marxist ideology was at times almost ignored in building the Communist party in China. The more it is adhered to in the future the more difficulties the Reds may have.

At present they seem to have a good many new problems. The liberals and moderate left wingers who joined them because of dislike for Generalissimo Chiang are becoming disillusioned as they begin to realize the Reds are anything but democrats. In addition the Communists are becoming unpopular in the great coastal cities their armies won from the Nationalists, as they have been unable to revive the trade on which these cities lived in the past. The Reds also are losing popularity in many farming areas. This is especially true in regions where high taxes have been levied by Communist offi-

cials or where the poor administration of the Reds has been unable to cope with disasters caused by floods or drought. And almost everywhere in China the praise by the Chinese Reds of the Soviet Union is a handicap to them—as the Chinese people are inclined to view all "foreign devils" as savages living in outer darkness.

Although the Communists in China still are enormously strong, largely because of the power of their army, they are in a curious position. If they try to deal with China's problems as something Stalinism will solve, regardless of the peculiar conditions in China, they will increase the magnitude of their tasks and over a period of years set the stage for their own destruction. They certainly must be tempted at times to become heretical Communists, at least to some degree, but it would be hard for them to do so without losing face in China and without sacrificing the support of the Soviet Union, on which they presumably set considerable value. They are victors for the moment—there is no doubt of that—but the dilemmas they face are grave and there is no assurance their victory is permanent.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of October 5, 1949]

RECOGNITION THE WAY TO SEAL CHINA'S FATE (By Raymond Lawrence)

Like the Russian bomb, the Russian recognition of the Communist regime in China was long anticipated and it was also expected that the satellites would dutifully append their diplomatic endorsements, which they did.

But, also like the bomb, this legal recognition raises new problems and presents the State Department with a fresh opportunity to lengthen the list of its mistakes in the Far East.

Moscow has planned, supported, encouraged, and inspired the Chinese Communists. Except in the minds of some Americans both inside and outside the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, there never has been the slightest doubt about these Moscow connections and the Communist character of the Chinese movement. Mao Tse-tung, the traditional party leader, made public his political persuasion and pledged fealty to Moscow. None of the other Communists concealed their allegiance.

So now comes the time when relations between the Soviet Union and the Peiping dictatorship are publicly avowed and formalized, so its proper place may be assigned in the Soviet hierarchy.

UN CHARGES

The moment is propitious, for the Government of China, through its delegates to the United Nations, has preferred charges against the U. S. S. R. Instead of answering the indictment and thus perhaps obviating inconvenient disclosures of assistance measures engineered in the Kremlin, the U. S. S. R. may present the case that the real Government—de facto and de jure—resides in Peiping and not in Canton.

It is the kind of diplomatic offensive that appeals to the less subtle instincts of Soviet diplomats who have never been noted for any of the refinements that lessen the normal frictions prevailing among nations.

But it should not necessarily, for this reason or any other logical consideration, appeal to the principles and policies of the United States Government. There may be far-eastern experts like Butterworth, Vincent, Fairchild, and others who wish to regularize their sympathies in the more decent forms of diplomatic procedure, but, then, there are always those who are willing to condone in the name of realism. There may be others who think they can do business with the Chinese Communists just as they thought they could do business with Hitler. This may be the case (although we doubt it any

more than in the case of the European satellites) but the trading will be exclusively on the terms of the Communists and not necessarily to the pecuniary advantage of the westerners. In any case, pecuniary advantage seldom is a solvent or stable basis for a foreign policy.

BRITISH POLICY

This is the weakness of the British position. British citizens have huge investments and commercial interests in China. In the eyes of these individuals, like their counterparts in America, immediate commercial considerations dictate early recognition. This, however, is only a part of the story.

Let us make haste slowly. This Communist "people's democracy" has no claim to popular validation. It came into being because a small group of party leaders parcelled out the top jobs, dropped a few crumbs to henchmen, and proclaimed a government. There was no popular vote, no free election, no foundation that anyone outside of the Communist party would call democratic.

Communism in China has high pretensions to being a popular movement, but the gulf between fact and fancy has never been bridged by any acceptable verification. There is not even any assurance that the Chinese Communists can produce the minimum of reform and reconstruction offered by the Nationalists and stifled, first, by the Japanese, and second, by the civil war.

STILL A REGIME

The Communists in China have set up a regime and nothing more. So far it has produced no evidence that it can conform to those conditions which international law requires in the event of recognition: A regular and permanent government, a respect for international obligations.

Obviously the Kremlin is satisfied that its creation in China will perform according to plan, but the rest of the powers, lacking this paternal solicitude, must judge the Communist regime by what it does rather than what it says.

Furthermore, there are more Chinese living in free China today than at the highest point of the Japanese advance. Something can be salvaged here, but the surest way to seal our disaster in China is to accord an indecently hasty recognition of a party dictatorship.

A. F. OF L. MAPPING WAR ON REDS

(By Victor Riesel)

ST. PAUL, October 3.—Your flight into this city carries you over 1,000 steel-picket lines into convention-filled hotels where the A. F. of L. labor giants are gathered who haven't led their millions of followers into a single major strike all this past year.

Your airlift over smokeless, silent steel mills, transports you into a convention city which is another labor world.

First off, leaders of the A. F. of L.'s powerful 8,000,000 members bluntly assert that the United States State Department was responsible for the Chinese Communists' new central government.

"The far-eastern division of the State Department seemed to favor the Communist cause in China and used its influence to prevent Congress from voting further aid to the Nationalist (Chiang) Government," the A. F. of L. chiefs here charge officially and angrily in their report to the convention—where most delegates represent a powerful union.

SERIOUS CHARGES

These are serious charges. They came from some of the Nation's most conservative, sober, and responsible labor circles—from men who'd much rather get back to their union business than spread themselves the world over.

For example, these same labor giants report here that they believe India remains as

the one great Asiatic nation able to take effective leadership in blocking Communist aggression. Upon India will fall the brunt of the responsibility for the democratic control of Asia.

No mere words these. If the oriental democratic forces knock off the political mobs like Capone's crowd fell to income-tax "T-men," a lot of our ex-GI's who sweltered in the Burma and Assam swamps, and guarded the rat-fringed fields from which we flew the Hump, won't need send their sons on similar malaria missions against a new enemy.

So these staid union men announce that "the wage earners of all democracies stand ready to cooperate with the wage earners of India" and those of deepest Africa too.

A. F. OF L. TAKES STEPS

Plans will be made here to checkmate this Red game. Already there is an A. F. of L. representative directing a Free Labor Bureau in Bombay, India—just as his chief, the curly-haired, easy-smiling Irving Brown, world-roving A. F. of L. representative, operates such a headquarters out of Brussels, and the federation's machine-gun-tongued Serafino Romauldi works in the Latin-American orbit.

They have been successful. Right now the report is that through publication of special newspapers, outright money loans, gifts of food, typewriters, paper, microphones, and other routine things of political life, the A. F. of L. has:

Strengthened the anti-Communist democratization league in Japan and so beat the Commies there; rehabilitated the free French unions which have sapped so much strength off the Reds that the Stalinists French labor outfits "no longer are capable of launching a paralyzing general strike" set up a "trade-union center in exile" in Paris which slips literature under Russia's iron curtain where an anti-Communist underground network relays it.

The A. F. of L. has helped organize a new western German trade-union federation, speaking for 5,000,000 German workers which will meet officially for the first time in Munich on October 12.

As I said, you fly into a new labor world here, and land amongst men making friends for us the world over. What happens here will be worth many an Army division later, somewhere on a foreign front.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe it is significant that, in addition to a great many Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who have been concerned about the policies enunciated and followed by the far-eastern division and the State Department, great newspapers throughout the Nation, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, also have been concerned about the policies we have followed. I think it is significant that the American Federation of Labor, which has a fine history in support of American institutions, should of their own volition have adopted resolutions on foreign policy, in which they also recognize what the American people are coming to understand—the betrayal that has taken place in the State Department of a wartime ally and a traditional friend.

I think it is significant, Mr. President, that, at the last national convention of the American Legion, very strong resolutions were adopted, condemning the policy of do nothing or of wait until the dust settles, which this country has followed in regard to the China policy. I predict that in time even more organizations and more individuals will

come to recognize that in this matter of international, global communism it is futile to attempt to stop it in Europe while "playing footsy" with it in Asia.

Mr. President, another matter which is related to this subject and one which I think is of considerable importance to the Senate, is the issue I have raised heretofore about the difficulty that Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and even our committees, at times, have in obtaining information from the executive branches of the Government. Under date of September 27, 1949, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, which I desire to read to the Senate:

SEPTEMBER 27, 1949.

The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,

State Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Yesterday, by telephone, my office requested from the office of Mr. Ernest A. Gross of the State Department that we be supplied with copies of all agreements and protocols signed at the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers held December 16-26, 1945.

Pursuant to this request there was sent to us the following documents:

One of these (marked by me as "A") is the radio address of Secretary of State Byrnes made at 10 p. m. eastern standard time, December 30, 1945.

The second (marked "B") is a State Department publication which contains the above-mentioned radio address plus what is entitled "Soviet-Anglo-American Communiqué" and "Report on Moscow Meeting of Foreign Ministers."

The third document (marked "C") is entitled "Moscow Agreement, 1945" which appears to contain the same information as in document B without the Byrnes radio address.

The inquiry, which as a Member of the Senate of the United States, I wish to address to you is this: Are there any agreements or protocols relating to China and the Far East that were agreed to or signed at the Moscow Foreign Ministers Conference, December 16-26, 1945 which are not included in these documents which were furnished me by the State Department.

On page 121 of his book *Speaking Frankly* former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes states as follows: "Members of the staff were asked to prepare the protocol to be signed by the three foreign ministers. This was completed about 2:30 in the morning and in a formal meeting there were nine copies that each of us had to sign. Mr. Bevin signed first and the papers were passed to me. After signing, I arose to say good-by to a member of the British delegation seated near me."

I would appreciate it very much if this information could be furnished me at the earliest possible date.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

That letter was dated the 27th of September. I have never had an answer to that letter, addressed by me, as a Member of the United States Senate, to the Secretary of State. So, on October 6, 1949, I addressed to the Honorable James E. Webb, Under Secretary of State, a letter reading as follows:

OCTOBER 6, 1949.

The Honorable JAMES E. WEBB,
Under Secretary of State,

State Department.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under date of September 27 I addressed a communication to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, copy of which is enclosed. I fully recognize that the

Secretary has been tremendously busy with the reconvening of the United Nations Assembly in New York and related matters. However, at your earliest convenience I would like to have the State Department's reply to the inquiry which I made.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

I have not had an answer to date from the Under Secretary of State. Mr. President, this is no personal matter, so far as I am concerned, but I do speak as a Member of the Senate of the United States. I at least had reason to believe there may have been some understandings or agreements arrived at in Moscow in 1945 other than those contained in the documents sent me. I am at least entitled to an answer as to whether there were such documents. If there were no such documents, it is a very simple matter to answer a United States Senator and say, "The information which we sent you is the complete information. There is no other verbal understanding; there is no other written understanding." If, on the other hand, there has been some other understanding, I am at least entitled, as a Senator of the United States, to have them say to me, "Senator, there are some additional agreements. However, because of national policies, or security reasons, or otherwise, we do not feel at this time that it is in the national interest to supply you with a copy." At least I am entitled, as a Senator of the United States, to that information. So long as the Senate remains in session and so long as this situation continues to arise, I intend to stand on the floor and protest as vigorously as I can this lowering of an iron curtain between the executive branch of the Government and the Congress of the United States. We, too, are charged with some policy decisions. We are responsible not only to the constituents in our own States, but, as Senators of the United States, we are responsible to the people in the other 47 States of the Union.

I am becoming terribly fed up, as one Member of the Senate of the United States, with having appointed officials, many of them in the lower echelons in the Government of the United States, making policy decisions which may adversely affect the very safety and security of this Nation, while at the same time information is denied to the elected representatives of the people either in the Senate of the United States or in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, there appeared an interesting little item in the United States News during the past week. I do not know whether it accurately portrays the situation, but I think I shall conclude my remarks by reading it into the RECORD. It is as follows:

Phillip Jessup, Ambassador at Large, who was expected to work out a policy for United States to follow on China, is pursuing a course of slow motion. Idea is that Congress may cool on the China issue, sparing the State Department the need to define publicly a new policy toward that part of the world.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that this not a footdragging which is taking place in the executive branch of the Government because, as one Member of the

Senate, I do not intend that this issue shall be allowed to be forgotten.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the statement which I made earlier in the day, I desire to read a letter which has just been received in my office from the Department of State. It was sent over to me on the floor of the Senate about 15 minutes ago. The date of the letter is October 7, 1949. It read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 7, 1949.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of September 27, 1949, in which you refer to three documents furnished you by the office of Assistant Secretary Gross, and in which you ask: "Are there any agreements or protocols relating to China and the Far East that were agreed to or signed at the Moscow Foreign Ministers' Conference, December 16-26, 1945, which are not included in these documents which were furnished me by the State Department?"

The protocol to which the former Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, refers in the portion of his book which is quoted in your letter is the document which is contained in State Department Publication No. 2653, entitled "Moscow Agreement, 1945, Between the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom."

The Department is unaware of the existence of any agreements or other international commitments with respect to China and the Far East entered into at the conference on behalf of the United States other than those published in the documents to which you refer.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Acting Secretary.

INVESTIGATION OF AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to say a word regarding the current public investigation of American grand strategy which is now going on and which I think is highly deplorable, for two reasons: First, it may convey to some hostile foreign power information which it does not already possess; and second, it will surely be used by the Communist propaganda machine to back up its contention that the United States is starting another war.

There is irony in the thought that the armed services, whose sole reason for existence is to provide for our national security, are now the subject of a public dispute which is actually impairing the strength of our position in the world. In no other country could one conceive of grand strategy being publicly discussed in this way. I think the Secretary of the Navy is correct in saying that this matter should be argued in private.

Mr. President, I do not think the Navy should be criticized for having classified as top secret a statement approved by its high ranking officers that morale in the Navy is low. The opinion of the chiefs of a service on morale is a matter of such vital importance that it should always be kept secret. During the war, morale reports were always kept secret because, obviously, if the enemy had known where morale was low, if he had known the units or the areas in which morale was low, he would surely have placed his

next attack in such areas. The same analogy holds true in this time of cold war. Indeed, if the publication of low morale in the Navy were to be followed by similar revelations of low morale in the Army and in the Air Force, it might be enough to induce a hostile power to conclude that this was the moment to attack the United States. There is, therefore, no doubt that if, for example, the ordinary civilian soldier or civilian sailor had made these revelations, the punishment which he would receive would be severe, and he would be considered reckless, self-centered, and unmilitary.

Insofar as morale in the face of reduced appropriations is concerned, we must always remember that all through the years following World War I the funds for the Regular Army were so curtailed that the Army could scarcely put a fully-equipped and manned battalion into the field for maneuvers. Yet morale in the Regular Army was not low, and out of those days came Eisenhower, Devers, Bradley, and Patton.

Morale should be able to stand adversity. I speak as one who has always supported and who expects to continue to support the Navy and naval aviation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I rise to join with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in his feeling of regret as to the present conflict between the branches of the armed forces. I wish to make a very brief reference to a statement which was made by a Navy commander yesterday when he gave his estimate of the worth of atomic explosives. They wanted a supercarrier in order to deliver the atomic bomb. Now when the issue of the supercarrier has been decided adversely the Navy finds the atomic bomb of small destructive force.

Approximately 6 months ago we heard from an English physicist by the name of Blackett. Mr. Blackett wrote a book which attempted, as I read it, to prove two things: First, that strategic bombing was not a particularly effective way of making modern war; second, that the Soviet position on atomic energy control is the correct one. The book has been referred to by many reviewers as an apologia for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' position expressed in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. His conclusions as to the way in which the political situation should be handled certainly leave a careful observer plenty of room to doubt the validity of his scientific estimate of the bomb.

I regret to state that the Blackett book, at least that part which is devoted to strategic bombing, seems to be the basic thesis of the testimony which was presented yesterday by the Navy to the Armed Services Committee of the House. The statements made yesterday were not true. It is dangerous to overemphasize the importance of the atomic weapon, but God knows it may be fatal to underemphasize it. It has seemed to me that the statement made by the commander to whom I have referred was about as silly as any I have ever heard of in my life; and to one who has contemplated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to say nothing of Bikini and Eniwetok it comes as a distinct shock that this kind of testimony

can be presented by a supposedly intelligent man. I join with the Senator from Massachusetts in the hope that this kind of action will stop before irreparable harm is done to our national security.

Mr. McMAHON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of the remarks which I made a few minutes ago a commentary I wrote on Mr. Blackett's book, which appeared in the February 1949 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, in which I think I pretty thoroughly demolished the Blackett thesis, upon which the Navy is operating.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT ON BLACKETT'S BOOK

(By Brien McMahon)

(Senator BRIEN McMAHON sponsored the legislation under which our domestic organization of atomic energy operates. He has recently been appointed Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.)

Dr. Blackett, the well-known British physicist, has written a book "debunking" atomic weapons. Yet Dr. Blackett's arguments, far from disparaging the atom, impress me as strengthening our fears.

He estimates, for example, that some 400 improved bombs would have been required to do the same damage to Germany as was actually done by the Allied bombing offensive, assuming the same average accuracy of attack and the same distribution in time.

This estimate is a narrow and cautious one: It ignores the likelihood that atomic bombs would cause many more human losses than an equivalent tonnage of ordinary bombs. It does not allow for lingering radiation which might delay the repair of devastated zones. The estimate assumes, too, that each of the 400 bombs would burst in the air. However, if some were detonated underwater in harbors, the victim nation might not only lose its port facilities but also suffer great havoc from radioactive spray which drifted over populous industrial areas.

But taking 400 bombs as the least quantity needed to duplicate the ruin visited upon Germany, how can we conclude that atomic energy is an exaggerated menace? Must we not conclude, rather, that 400 bombs is a terrifying small number? Must we not conclude that hostile planes, aided by surprise and attacking at night, could deliver 400 bombs in one raid and that America might suffer as much damage between sunset and sunrise as Germany suffered in 6 whole years of aerial warfare? Any American who has seen the horror of present-day Germany—as I have—may perhaps be pardoned for committing what Dr. Blackett regards as a cardinal sin, namely, placing atomic weapons in a class by themselves.

Curiously enough, Dr. Blackett uses his terrifyingly low figure of 400 bombs as a basis for arguing that the atomic bomb alone cannot play a decisive role in any world war fought during the next 5 or 10 years. He contends that the equivalent of 400 atomic bombs was not even decisive in defeating Germany and that, therefore, it would certainly fall to subdue either America or Russia. The fact that Germany absorbed aerial punishment slowly at first and in heavy doses only after a long, gradual build-up does not impress Dr. Blackett. He indicates that concentration of the punishment in a very brief time—as is possible with atomic weapons—would make little difference, and that the bombed nation could still continue to fight.

This is really like arguing that if you put out both a man's eyes and cut off an arm and

a leg, he may nevertheless survive. Accepting the argument as valid, is it comforting to learn that we will keep struggling after we lose two-thirds of our big cities?

Actually the argument can be challenged on many grounds. For example, Dr. Blackett quotes liberally from Liddell Hart's book entitled "The Revolution in Warfare," but he does not quote the following passage from that book:

"Decisive results come sooner from sudden shocks than from long-drawn pressure. Shocks throw the opponent off his balance. Pressure allows him time to adjust himself to it. That military lesson is closely linked with the general experience of history that human beings have an almost infinite power of accommodation to degradation of living conditions, so long as the process is gradual."

Liddell Hart, himself a highly conservative military thinker, seems to imply that Dr. Blackett is wrong and that brief, severe atomic attacks could achieve a decision against Russia or America.

Both countries possess an Achilles' heel which Dr. Blackett neglects. Russia's weak point may consist of the flimsy railroad network which binds her far-flung empire. Our own weak point is the 50,000,000 Americans who live in crowded cities of 30,000 or more people. If 400 of Dr. Blackett's "improved" atomic bombs landed suddenly on these cities, and if average casualties merely equaled those inflicted upon Nagasaki, we would suffer 16,000,000 deaths and 16,000,000 injuries—a total of 32,000,000 or 23 percent of our entire population. The near simultaneous detonation of 400 bombs might also create such intense clouds of radioactivity as to occasion many additional American losses. Germany surrendered when only about 15 percent of her people became casualties; and Japan surrendered when only about 8 percent of her people had been struck.

Without speculating about pure radiological warfare or the possibility of a new super-bomb, I am inclined to fear that atomic weapons numbered in hundreds could be delivered rapidly and could force the surrender of America or Russia. But there is no need to quibble over numbers. Dr. Blackett admits that thousands of bombs might conquer a continental power; and he further refers to the time when Russia will possess this many bombs.

In other words, Dr. Blackett is like the man who leaps from the top of a skyscraper and who shouts, while passing the fifth-story window, "Everything's fine so far." Dr. Blackett does not expect Russia to amass thousands of bombs for some years, and, therefore, he informs us that our fears are exaggerated and that "Everything's fine so far" because, in his extremely cautious appraisal, any war during the next decade could only ravage America to the extent Germany was ravaged.

It is easy to point out other remarkable aspects of Dr. Blackett's book. He regards the horrors of Hiroshima as real but deplors the publicity given this reality. He concludes that atomic weapons are not so frightening after all—but frightening enough to justify Russia in enslaving the countries of eastern Europe and using them as a cushion against atomic attack. America's attempt to secure allies is portrayed as sinister imperialism, but Russia's complete domination of 100,000,000 Europeans is at least pardonable if not actually praiseworthy.

The fact that Germany, with all her technical and industrial genius, rarely shot down 10 percent of an Allied bomber formation does not discourage Dr. Blackett from discoursing at length upon raids in which 90 percent of the attackers would invariably be destroyed. He pictures 2,000 miles as an extreme range for aircraft developed during the next 5 years; but existing planes, with a bomb-load and full combat equipment, have already proved the feasibility of ranges over 4,000 miles. He stresses that an ag-

gressor's air bases would be vulnerable to counterattack; but he fails to mention the aggressor might exploit surprise to destroy his victim's bases and thus avert retaliation. He speaks of atomic raids confined to military points and factory areas—just as though an aggressor could destroy Floyd Bennett Field in New York City or the Pittsburgh steel mills without also destroying tens of thousands of civilians.

Dr. Blackett's criticism of the United Nations plan for control of atomic energy assumes that the atomic bomb is just another weapon—an assumption which his own arguments refute. Logically, then, the apologies he advances for Russian rejection of the United Nations plan crumble to the ground.

Dr. Blackett argues that the Kremlin fears atomic controls because these would involve a factory quota for each nation and thus—allegedly—limit Russia's use of the atom for industrial power. But here Dr. Blackett has clearly outwitted himself. Russia's own diplomats express approval of factory quotas—about the only feature of an effective control plan which they do endorse. Therefore Dr. Blackett has put an excuse in Stalin's mouth which Stalin's personal spokesmen contradict. Of course America never has and never will advocate placement of a ceiling on the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Dr. Blackett suggests that the Kremlin does not trust us—that lack of confidence helps explain its attitude. Here again Dr. Blackett has outwitted himself. Since the men of the Kremlin know that we alone possess atomic weapons and since they persist in an aggressive policy, they must repose the utmost faith in America's passion for peace. Otherwise, the Kremlin would surely appease us with all its might and main, until Russia had amassed her own atomic weapons. Furthermore, the whole point of our control proposal is to guarantee security for all men and all nations, no matter how intensely they may mistrust one another. Also, to say that the Kremlin balks because it lacks confidence is to become involved in a vicious circle. How else could men create real confidence except through the establishment of atomic peace?

An effective control plan must take effect by gradual stages. According to the Lillenthal plan, the first stage would consist of a world-wide survey for uranium deposits. Dr. Blackett reasons that America would peek behind the iron curtain, would learn the location of Russian factories and bases as a result of the first stage, but would not surrender atomic weapons until afterward. Thus, if plans for control broke down at the end of the first stage, Dr. Blackett claims that Russia would have lost important secrets, whereas we would have lost nothing.

But this argument puts the Kremlin in the position of a man who murders his father and mother and then pleads for mercy as an orphan. By raising an iron curtain between the Russian people and western peoples, the Kremlin has in my judgment committed an act of aggression against the peace of the world. Yet Dr. Blackett pleads that we must sympathize with Moscow because the first stage of a control plan would mitigate the effects of that crime.

Today Russians can travel anywhere they please in America. They know the exact location of our big factories, our military bases, our vital points. We do not even know the location of whole cities situated behind the Russian Urals. Perhaps Dr. Blackett would have us drop an iron curtain ourselves, relocate all our own cities and factories, and generally remake the map of the United States. Then, in the first stage of a control plan, the Kremlin would discover as much new intelligence about us as we discovered about the Soviet Union.

Dr. Blackett also emphasizes that Russia might be outvoted by other countries sitting

on an atomic control commission. But the language of any treaty establishing UN control over the atom would protect all of Russia's legitimate rights. If she could not always have her way on issues left to the discretion of a control commission, the same would be true of America and every other state. Does Dr. Blackett advise us to let the Kremlin conquer all of Europe and all of Asia—so that it would then dictate to a majority of the world's nations and thus be certain of having its way on every issue, large and small?

In all of Dr. Blackett's long book only one footnote hints at what may be the real reason why Moscow opposes the United Nations plan. Is the Kremlin afraid that Russians who became UN inspectors would visit America and observe the American standard of living? Is the Kremlin fearful that these Russians would taste the heady wine of liberty—and that they would compare their own unhappy plight with conditions in the West?

Is the Kremlin perhaps afraid that western inspectors in Russia would glimpse Soviet concentration camps? Does the Kremlin fear that Europeans would observe its secret police in action, its iron-fisted control of labor unions, and the luxuries accorded members of the Communist elite as compared with the poverty-stricken lot of ordinary Russians?

Certainly the iron curtain nourishes and protects the Kremlin in many vital ways. Russia can appropriate our technical knowledge and use it to forge weapons, without offering anything in exchange. She can keep her eye on us, though we cannot keep our eye on her. She can see, but we are blind.

Even more important, the iron curtain means that Moscow can flood the western world with propaganda; Moscow can use our own democratic instruments of publicity to undermine democracy; and yet Moscow can prevent western ideas and western opinion from reaching Russia. When Vishinsky or Molotov addresses the United Nations Assembly, his words are printed in newspapers throughout the globe. When an American ventures to reply, his speech is printed only in the West—never in the East.

I gravely fear that the iron curtain has enabled the Kremlin to win brilliant victories in the propaganda war—as evidenced by Dr. Blackett's book. Since the Kremlin exports revolutionary symbols but never imports them, since the Kremlin can use the United Nations as a sounding board to magnify its voice, but can muffle the sound of anyone else's voice, Russia speaks in a roar, and we respond with a whisper.

Are these the real reasons why the Soviet opposes atomic peace? Does Moscow believe that lifting the iron curtain would result in disclosures shocking to the civilized world? Such pertinent questions are not even asked, much less discussed, in Dr. Blackett's book.

We know that anything less than effective atomic control would be worse than nothing. Under a slipshod, faulty plan neither America nor Russia could afford to assume that the other was not making atomic weapons in secret. Under such a plan both sides would consider it more dangerous to play fair than to cheat. Or, if we played fair, the Kremlin might cheat and thereby amass enough hidden weapons to threaten the world. Therefore, given a plan containing loopholes, the armaments race would continue. The control proposals we originally made; the proposals which the United Nations has studied, revised, and improved; the proposals which the great majority of mankind now supports—these proposals are the minimum necessary to safeguard one and all against foul play.

Dr. Blackett tries to argue that our insistence upon effective control is really a foolish demand for absolute security. He might as well argue that insistence upon

policemen to regulate motor traffic is the same as demanding the total abolishment of automobile accidents. Absolute security against atomic attack vanished forever on July 16, 1945, when the first bomb was tested at Alamogordo, N. Mex. Even if men established a full-blown world government, they might later fight a world civil war in which atomic weapons would be used. Even if Russia or America established an hegemony over the whole earth, a later revolt might bring atomic weapons into play. If the United Nations control plan were adopted, any nation at any time could seize the atomic plants located in its territory, exclude international inspectors, and commence producing weapons. The remaining countries, forewarned, would, of course, race to produce atomic weapons for defense. We ask only for the least restraints, the least controls which would make it safer for all peace-loving nations to destroy atomic armaments than to continue manufacturing them.

I will not dwell on the point that Dr. Blackett writes a book to attack the United Nations plan and then proposes nothing concrete in its place. The UN plan is based on an appreciation of the technical facts and the facts of nuclear physics. The spectacle of a noted nuclear physicist defying those laws and advancing vague suggestions which ignore the technical facts speaks for itself.

Nor will I dwell on Dr. Blackett's attempt to blacken our motives in using the two atomic bombs against Japan. Here he commits a logical fallacy so obvious that it could hardly have escaped his own notice; even if some hindsight commentators are right in saying that Japan would have quickly surrendered without the use of the two bombs and prior to a land invasion, President Truman lacked this knowledge at the time of his decision. Dr. Blackett apparently blames the President for failing to read the United States Strategic Bombing Survey—a document which had not yet come into existence. All the evidence shows that Mr. Truman ordered the two bombs to be dropped in the sincere belief that they would obviate a land invasion and save hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of lives. Personally, I think that this belief was not mistaken and that many an American, British, Russian, and Japanese boy is alive today solely because the two bombs gave Japan a face-saving pretext for capitulation.

Is it not a shame that no Russian apologist for America dares express himself inside the Soviet Union? Is it not sad that no Russian apologist for America may stress our refusal to annex a single inch of territory from the defeated Axis countries? That no Russian apologist for America may tell how we demobilized our vast armed forces almost overnight? That no Russian apologist for America may describe our offer to give up the atomic bomb, to admit Russian inspectors inside our borders, and even to allow foreign operation of our atomic factories? It offends my sense of justice that apologists for the Kremlin, such as Dr. Blackett, can appeal to Western opinion, whereas apologists for the West may not so much as whisper in Russia.

I imagine that the Russian people, if they knew the details of the United Nations plan and were free to discuss it, would quickly scuttle Dr. Blackett's criticisms and would join hands with us to achieve the blessedness of real atomic peace. The No. 1 task before us, therefore, is conquest of the iron curtain.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to House bill 160.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment, I was wondering how long he would take. I had hoped we could dispose of the pending amendment to the farm bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It will take me only about 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 160) to amend section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this message concerns a bill which passed the Senate by unanimous consent after an amendment by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] was agreed to. When the bill reached the House, the House did not like the amendment. The matter was taken up with the Senator from New Jersey, and with others of the group which had sponsored the amendment, and they said it was all right with them to let the bill go through as the House wanted it. So, so far as I know, there is unanimous consent on the part of all concerned.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

WILDER DAM PROJECT, VERMONT—REQUEST TO FILE ADDITIONAL INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] I request that he be granted permission to file additional individual views on Senate Joint Resolution 58, providing for a rehearing in the matter of the Bellows Falls Hydroelectric Corp. project No. 1892, known as the Wilder Dam project, and a review of any order of the Federal Power Commission thereon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether he knows the purpose of this request? I know that the Senator from Kansas, around the 1st of August, assured other Members of the Senate he was going to make a minority report, and he did not make any at all until just 2 or 3 weeks ago. In the meantime the power company had gone ahead building the dam, in complete disregard of the desires of the officials of the State of Vermont and the effect on farmers who own some 5,000 acres of class I land in the valley affected. The power interests seek delay, and the Senator from Kansas is playing right into their hands by contributing to the delay.

I am wondering if we cannot have this matter brought before the Senate. The joint resolution passed the Senate unanimously last year, and has been reported by the committee presided over by the Senator from Colorado by an overwhelming vote this year. I know there is such a thing as Senatorial courtesy, but I am wondering if there is not such a thing as carrying it too far. The farmers affected have had served on them papers in condemnation proceedings; they have been haled into court, they have to go

into court right away; and the only hope is that the Congress of the United States will intercede in their behalf. They have never had an opportunity to appeal to the courts the granting of the license by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont knows that the Senator from Colorado and a majority of the committee have supported his position straight through.

Mr. AIKEN. I realize that, and the Senator from Kansas is the only dissenter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He is the only dissenter on the committee. The Senator from Kansas objected to a statement that was made in the majority report, and desires to point out the inaccuracies, as he deems them, in the report. I have his report before me ready to file, so that there cannot be any possible delay, or any reason for delay.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, if the report is ready, that is all right. What I was fearful of was that the Senator from Kansas might take more time to prepare the report, and thereby cause greater delay.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the very good report which they submitted to the Senate on the joint resolution, and the position which they took, which was a position entirely fair to the State of Vermont and the farmers of Vermont and New Hampshire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STABILIZATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as the pending question is the amendment I have offered, I hope we can get a vote on it without further interruption. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	McCarthy
Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Baldwin	Hendrickson	McFarland
Brewster	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Bridges	Hill	McMahon
Byrd	Holland	Magnuson
Cain	Humphrey	Malone
Capehart	Hunt	Martin
Chavez	Ives	Maybank
Connally	Jenner	Millikin
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Donnell	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Douglas	Johnson, S. C.	Murray
Downey	Kefauver	Myers
Eaton	Kem	Neely
Ellender	Kilgore	O'Connor
Ferguson	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Langer	Pepper
George	Lodge	Robertson
Gillette	Long	Russell
Graham	Lucas	Saltonstall

Schoeppel	Thye	Williams
Taft	Watkins	Young
Taylor	Wherry	
Thomas, Okla.	Wiley	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not want to delay the Senate and do not intend to occupy more than 2 or 3 minutes of its time. As the Senate knows, we discussed the subject thoroughly on last Tuesday, had a vote on it, and decided it. The amendment was rephrased and resubmitted, and we discussed it at great length on Friday up until the last minute of the session on Friday evening.

All I wish to do at this moment is to read again the statement of Mr. Winthrop Brown of the State Department on this subject. I read it again because I know some Senators did not hear it when I read it before into the RECORD on last Friday evening. Mr. Winthrop Brown is in charge of the negotiations under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for this country.

There is obviously a difference of opinion about the significance of the amendment. The Senator from Washington says it is only carrying out the law, that it is only a clarifying amendment. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who certainly knows as much if not more than any other Senator about reciprocal trade agreements and our whole foreign-trade structure, says that in his opinion it would be disastrous to the carrying on of our foreign trade under the reciprocal trade agreements to adopt the amendment. It does have an effect upon the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and would make it very difficult, if not impossible, to extend those agreements. Mr. Brown sums it up, not as the final answer to the merits, but he certainly would know, I think, the significance of the amendment. If the Senate chooses to adopt the amendment with knowledge of Mr. Brown's statement, of course, that is its privilege. I quote:

It—

That is, the amendment—

It would require the termination of any agreement that was in contravention of section 22. What "in contravention of" means is not entirely clear when one reads the broad and varied language of section 22 with all the findings in its provision and the proviso which it contains, but the amendment could, and it undoubtedly intended to mean, that any agreement which in any way limited the absolute right under section 22 to impose quotas would be "in contravention of," the section. If so, it is subject to the same objections as the previous amendment and would require renegotiations and possible loss of the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

It would be a major tragedy and major blow to our foreign policy to lose the general agreement. This represents years of international negotiations. It is the most important step ever taken toward world tariff reductions. Its provisions allow extensive and fair use of section 22. To break this agreement down by United States action would be a rude blow to United States prestige and disheartening to all who are looking to the United States for leadership.

It seems to me that, at the very least, we ought to give sufficient credence and acceptance to that statement to have the amendment referred to the Committee on Finance, and it ought to be considered in the regular order in that committee and then submitted to the Senate, if it has merit in it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on page 16, line 16, of the committee amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea." If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business with leave of the Senate. If pres-

ent and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] who is absent on official business with the leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Baldwin	Hunt	Morse
Brewster	Ives	Mundt
Bridges	Jenner	Murray
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Schoeppel
Capehart	Kilgore	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Taylor
Donnell	Langer	Thye
Downey	Lodge	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Young
Hendrickson	Martin	

NAYS—28

Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Douglas	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Long	Pepper
Fulbright	Lucas	Robertson
George	McClellan	Russell
Graham	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McMahon	
Holland	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—23

Bricker	Hayden	Sparkman
Butler	Hoey	Stennis
Chapman	Kerr	Thomas, Utah
Dulles	Leahy	Tobey
Eastland	McCarran	Tydings
Flanders	Reed	Vandenberg
Frear	Smith, Maine	Withers
Green	Smith, N. J.	

So Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Magnuson amendment was just agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The question is

on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Magnuson amendment was agreed to.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I submitted on Friday last to House bill 5345, and ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, in line 23, it is proposed to delete the period, insert a colon in lieu thereof and the following provision: "Provided, however, That in the case of new lands being brought into production for the first time in the year 1950 and which have no production history, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to waive acreage allotments or marketing quotas for a period of time not to exceed 2 years."

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, it will be noted that I have circumscribed the amendment by applying it to only the year 1950, and that I have further limited the amendment by providing that it shall not apply for longer than 2 years.

This amendment is offered for the sole purpose of making it possible for a very few individuals, principally ex-servicemen, whom the Government has invited to take up homesteads, and settle on the land; and the amendment will make it possible for them to produce one cash crop the first year.

The Senate will understand that I have taken up this matter with the Secretary of Agriculture, and the amendment meets with his approval. I should also like to have the Senate know that I have taken up this matter with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I could not tell, because of the noise in the Chamber, whether the Senator stated that the Secretary of Agriculture has approved or has disapproved the amendment.

Mr. HUNT. I said the Secretary of Agriculture approves this amendment.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUNT. The Bureau of Reclamation also approves this amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment will have absolutely no appreciable effect on the over-all program as set forth in the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Wyoming to say that the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the amendment?

Mr. HUNT. Certainly, that is exactly what I said; and I got it directly from the Secretary of Agriculture, not from an understudy.

Mr. President, as I said, the amendment affects so little acreage that it will have absolutely no effect whatever on the over-all program. In my State in the past few years we have been opening up new reclamation projects. We have been

inviting ex-servicemen from all over the United States to apply for those units. Week before last my colleague attended an opening or drawing at Powell, Wyo., and last week there was a similar opening in my own county of Fremont, where some 50 units were drawn by ex-servicemen. Those ex-servicemen have been invited by the Government to settle on the projects. Congress has appropriated money to make those projects possible.

But under the bill as it is now written, it is practically impossible for ex-servicemen to settle on those units and make any return, to speak of, in the first 2 or 3 years, especially in the first year, because it is practically impossible to get the land into such shape within that period of time that it will produce row crops and the other crops which are produced in irrigated areas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder what the Senator's definition of "new land" would be. The Senator probably knows that on some of the old estates there is land which was producing crops 100 years ago, but since then has been abandoned, and has grown up into woodland. At times that land is cleared off again, is plowed again, and is planted to potatoes or some other crop. Would the Senator consider that such land, which had not been in cultivation for 100 years, would be "new land"?

Mr. HUNT. My answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Vermont is that my conception of "new land" is land which has no previous crop-production history, land which has never been in production.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the amendment would perhaps exclude land in the East and in the South which perhaps had not been under cultivation for 100 years. Would it not be better to include such land?

Mr. HUNT. I do not quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont. If an area of land has been out of production for 15 or 20 years, and subsequently comes back into production, I certainly think it should be considered new land. I think I know what the Senator from Vermont has in mind.

This amendment would apply to a small acreage of land in Michigan or Minnesota where the timber had been cut off and where some of the land is now coming into production. The amendment also would apply to a small acreage in Oklahoma or possibly in some of the delta States, where lands are being drained, in some cases by the Government, and now are coming into production. I would consider those lands as having no previous crop history.

But let me say to the distinguished Senator that including all the categories to which I have just referred, the land covered by the amendment would not amount to one-tenth of 1 percent of the total of 300,000,000 acres of land now under cultivation in the United States. So my amendment could have no effect whatsoever on the over-all crop program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I sympathize with the purpose of the amendment, which is to make the newly irrigated land exempt from quotas for several years. On the other hand, we find that much of the fruit land in the East is old land which was in cultivation two or three or four generations ago, and then reverted to forest, but later was cleared again. Much of that land makes the best orchard sites, or can be used for other purposes. Ordinarily I would not wish to see that land excluded from consideration, although it probably would not make too much difference, either acreage-wise or percentage-wise.

However, I would not want all this encouragement given solely to newly irrigated lands, but I would wish to have the same advantages made available to all the other States, too.

Mr. HUNT. Of course, Mr. President, my amendment makes no reference to irrigated land, for I was quite familiar with the lands referred to by the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Wyoming is quite correct about that. The amendment should not apply solely to irrigated lands, and it does not.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Wyoming has a very splendid and useful amendment. We in South Dakota expect to have some new irrigated tracts come into production within a year or two. We also have some land which is constantly being occupied for farming by veterans and other persons who are moving on to land not previously farmed.

However, it occurs to me that the amendment in its present language could possibly have one evil consequence. In South Dakota and in some of the other States in that area we have been suffering, in the past few years, from a sort of corporation farmer who has moved in from the outside, usually from Texas or Oklahoma, with a lot of high-powered equipment, and has turned up a large amount of our very fine native pasture land and some of our buffalo grass, and has gone there as a sort of hit-and-run farmer to make a "slot-machine" killing, if he can, as a result of getting one crop, and then is prepared to move on, after having destroyed some of our fine range land. I think it would be unfortunate if this proposal should become an inducement and an encouragement to that type of practice.

I have discussed it with the able Senator from Wyoming, and have suggested an amendment to his amendment which will meet that specific situation, and which I believe he will find acceptable. I should like to read it at this time, if I may: "On line 7 of the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming strike out the period after the word 'years' and insert 'to the extent of 80 acres by any operator for any specified product'."

That would limit it to the purpose we have in mind, namely, to make these lands available to young farmers and veterans on new tracts. It would not be an inducement or an encouragement to the practice we are trying to stop, in our part of the country. I wonder whether the Senator will accept the modification.

Mr. HUNT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I am glad to accept the modification. Did the Senator indicate the number of acres to which it is limited?

Mr. MUNDT. Eighty acres.

Mr. HUNT. That is very agreeable, so far as I am concerned. I may say that for my people, a limitation of 20 acres would be agreeable. However, I am very much pleased to go along with the 80-acre provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 23, it is proposed to delete the period, insert colon and the following provision: "Provided, however, That in the case of new lands being brought into production for the first time in the year 1950 and which have no production history, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to waive acreage allotments or marketing quotas for a period of time not to exceed 2 years to the extent of 80 acres by any operator for any specified product."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I understood the Senator to say the amendment was for the benefit of the veteran.

Mr. HUNT. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Eighty acres would not be enough for a man taking up a quarter of a section under the irrigation law.

Mr. HUNT. I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the units are limited to 160 acres. In the past, these homesteaders have gotten all their acreage under cultivation within 10, 15, or even 20 years. As I suggested, for my people in Wyoming, settling on the reclamation projects, I would accept a limitation of 20 acres. Under the present law, or under the bill as it is now written, they will get about an acre and a half each.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator for accepting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, as modified.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, has the Senator from Wyoming concluded?

Mr. HUNT. I had not quite concluded my remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I want to read a letter from one of the ex-servicemen who have settled on the allotments. The letter is addressed to the junior Senator from Wyoming, and reads as follows:

SHOSHONI, WYO., September 2, 1949.
HON. LESTER C. HUNT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have our next regular homesteaders meeting next September 13. If you have been able to make any progress regarding special wheat allotments for this new land I would like to make a report of it at this meeting. Several of the homesteaders have asked me recently if I had received any additional information.

Wheat allotments for 1950 have already been made as set up under the present ruling which is 3 percent of the counties total wheat

acreage. Fremont County has a total acreage of about 5,500. So that gives 165 acres to be divided up between 55 of us new fellows or 3 acres each. Of course that varies with the individual farms. As you can see that is very insignificant. Then, too, as time goes on other crops will come under allotments. So unless there is a law or ruling to permit special crop acreage allotments to new land with no previous crop history we will be in very dire circumstances. We feel this is a very urgent matter.

With best wishes,

CARROLL A. RIGGS.

Mr. President, I also have a letter urging acceptance of the amendment from the Congress from the United States Department of Agricultural Council in the State of Wyoming, composed of various agricultural organizations. I shall not take the time to read the letter, but merely to say it urges adoption of the amendment and makes a special plea for these men who need so badly to have some cash crop the first year they are on the projects.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is not merely of a great interest to the State of Wyoming, but should be of interest to the Senators from other States which have a similar problem.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], that other States are interested, I should like to say to the Senator that we in Nebraska have new lands which will come into production during the current fiscal year, and that there are several projects, some of which will bring in land next year. Naturally we are intensely interested in the waiving of the acreage limitations and marketing quotas on the new land. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for offering the amendment. I think the modification suggested by the Senator from South Dakota, which has been accepted by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, will be most helpful in having the amendment adopted by those who might otherwise attempt to secure quotas and acreage limitations on larger tracts.

There is one question I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, which I think ought to be made clear in the record.

The language of the amendment is:

Provided, however, That in the case of new lands being brought into production for the first time—

And so forth. What is the Senator's definition of "new lands being brought into production for the first time"? Is it applicable to irrigation only, or does it apply to land on someone's farm that is not in cultivation but which can be plowed and considered as new land? I believe if the Senator from Wyoming will make an observation on that point it will be helpful in the record.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his remarks. My definition of what should be considered as new lands would include lands from which the timber is being cropped, say in Michigan and in Minnesota. I would

consider as new lands the lands which are now being drained in Oklahoma, even though, a long period of years ago, they may have had some production. I did not limit the amendment purely to irrigated agricultural lands, for the reason that I anticipated other Senators would want some lands in their States included. But I again want to say that the inclusion of all these lands, in all these categories, would make absolutely no appreciable difference in the crop plan.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder whether the Senator from Nebraska has not, along with the Senator from Vermont, put his finger on an ambiguity of language which will make the provision rather difficult to administer. The language is, "that in the case of new lands being brought into production for the first time in the year 1950." The language "being brought into production for the first time" must mean for the first time. I wonder whether this is not what is sought to be expressed—in the case of new lands being brought into production for the first time since the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; in other words, "brought into production for the first time" since this program has been in effect. I think if the Senator will offer an amendment along that line, he will meet the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and resolve the ambiguity, which I think is very real, as the language now reads.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would help considerably if we went back to the year 1938. Most of the tillable land in the East was put under cultivation during the war period. Land that had been used before was put to work during the war, and of course there are quotas. There is an historic basis for fixing quotas on it. I think the acreage that would be put to use, which was not in use since 1938, would be pretty small.

Mr. MUNDT. It would be very small.

Mr. AIKEN. But I can conceive of orchards being planted on that type of land. In fact, I have known of land which has been cleared for the planting of fruit trees. I would not really want to exclude that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure if the language is left as it is, it will defeat some of the objectives the Senator has in mind. Some of our irrigated land has been farmed at some time in the past, by way of dry farming and through other methods. I am sure the Senator wants such land to be covered by the amendment. I think if the Senator would change the language in the direction I suggested, it would improve the workability of the amendment.

Mr. HUNT. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota, and again I express my appreciation for his suggestion.

Therefore I would modify my amendment to read as follows:

Provided, however, That in the case of any lands being brought into production for the first time since the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair correctly understand that the Senator from Wyoming further modifies his amendment according to the language which he has just read?

Mr. HUNT. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator strike out the words "in the year of 1950," or are they left in?

Mr. HUNT. That is rather immaterial. I believe the words "in the year of 1950" are left in, because it will not become effective until the year 1950. It is rather immaterial, but I believe it will be helpful to leave those words in.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may make a suggestion—of course I am not in any way trying to rewrite the Senator's amendment—it seems to me it could be done in this way, and I should like to know the reaction of the Senator from Wyoming to the suggestion:

In case of new lands being brought into production for the first time—

Then skipping the words "in the year of 1950"—

which have no production history, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to waive acreage allotments or marketing quotas for the year 1950 and for a period of time not to exceed 2 years.

I think that will make the amendment grammatically correct and will carry out the intention of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator very kindly. I agree with the Senator, and will modify my amendment in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming further modifies his amendment in accordance with the language just stated.

Mr. HUNT. I shall read it for the benefit of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I shall read the whole amendment as it has now been modified:

Provided, however, That in the case of new lands brought into production for the first time since the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and which have no production history, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to waive acreage allotments or marketing quotas in the year of 1950 and for a period of time not to exceed 2 years.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in order that the Record may be complete, will the Senator also read the concluding language?

Mr. HUNT. I say to the Senator from New Mexico that as I stated the amendment it did not include the modification by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to say that it is certainly inconsistent, if it is not almost ridiculous, that

we should invite ex-servicemen to take up units of land and start to make homes for themselves, and at the same time, through the passage of any act, say to them, "you can produce only an acre or up to 3 acres of wheat." That is the cash crop which they need in order economically to survive for the first year or two on the new lands. Let me say that I am speaking from close and intimate knowledge, for the projects which I have in mind are in my own State, and one of them is in my own county. I am not asking for anything which will injure the farm program in any way. It will allow ex-servicemen taking up new lands to produce a cash crop and exist until such times as they have an opportunity to acquire machinery, stock, and so forth, which requires time and money to accomplish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that the clerk state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 23, it is proposed to insert the following provision: "*Provided, however, That in the case of new lands brought into production for the first time since the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and which have no production history, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to waive acreage allotments or marketing quotas in the year of 1950 and for a period of time not to exceed 2 years, to the extent of 80 acres by any operator for any specified product.*"

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I now know what it feels like to be about to cut one's own throat. This amendment could be of tremendous benefit to me in a particular problem in my own State where, in one section of the State, by the use of pumping, cotton acreage has been increased since the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1938 from zero to 60,000 acres. Every acre, under this amendment, would get a cotton history and would be allowed to come into the program. The amendment would be of deep interest, I am sure, to the State of California, where 50,000 acres have just been brought in in one area under cooperative arrangement with various persons. All they have to do is to transfer 80 acres to a single operator. It might be 80 acres of wheat, 80 acres of cantaloupes, 80 acres of cotton, and so on down the list. The limitation is restricted only by the number of agricultural commodities in the spectrum, if there is such a word relating to agricultural products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator not recognize that since the amendment offered by my colleague places the administration of the amendment solely within the power of the Secretary of Agriculture, any such "ring-around-the-rosy" as the Senator now mentions could easily be stopped by administrative action?

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize that, but I also recognize that the Secretary has approved this amendment, so I assume he approves the "ring-around-the-rosy."

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HUNT. Does not the distinguished Senator from New Mexico realize that the Secretary of Agriculture carefully analyzed and definitely understood what his authority would be if the amendment should be adopted, and that is why he gave it his approval?

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize that the farmers prefer to get their acreage by virtue of law and not by virtue of the largesse of the Secretary of Agriculture. They do not care to come to the Secretary with their hats in their hands and say, "Please give me 80 acres. I want to plant cotton in the Tucumcari project in New Mexico." They want to say, "By virtue of the law passed by the Congress of the United States and by virtue of the history I have accumulated, I am entitled to acreage."

I hate to say this, because no one is more sincere than is the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming. I know the problem of which he speaks. I think it needs to be corrected. I submit to him that this amendment does not correct it. I am sure his amendment would be better with the 80-acre limitation, but not for any specified product. I think the Senator from South Dakota ought to urge the modification of the amendment so that only 80 acres in total could be used by any one operator. But I respectfully suggest that this is not the place to write corrections in connection with our cotton acreage and our limitations as to wheat acreage and various other things.

There was a bill before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to correct the cotton acreage situation. We spent 6 weeks holding hearings. The bill has been passed and signed. To it were added a limitation on peanut acreage and a limitation on wheat acreage. I was not very happy over the suggestion offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] or by his colleague the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], but we have worked out a compromise which I thought was satisfactory. This amendment, in my opinion, throws it wide open and says to anyone, "If you wish to go out and tear up the terrain of the State of Colorado or the State of South Dakota, so long as you can bring in new land by 1950 you can have 3 years in which to get history and you can go ahead."

Mr. MUNDT. It is to extend to only 80 acres.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that, but I understand also that can be multiplied by as many digits as there are.

Mr. MUNDT. It represents a very small factor.

Mr. ANDERSON. I, too, come from the State of South Dakota and my people once owned a great stretch of land west of Okaton in that State. That particular area was the center of a cattle trade and we owned a good deal of land along a river. That land became valueless because in the period after the First World War people rushed to areas where wheat grows and ripped up the buffalo grass,

which the Senator from South Dakota is as anxious as I am to preserve, and that land has not been worth anything for a whole generation. Now, again, it is becoming valuable as pasture land, where the topsoil is knit together, and I hope we will not start to rip it up again.

Mr. HUNT and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield first to the distinguished author of the amendment.

Mr. HUNT. Let me suggest that the amendment to my amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota be further modified to the extent of placing the word "one" after the word "any," making it read "to the extent of 80 acres by any one operator."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator offer that as a modification of his amendment?

Mr. HUNT. Yes; I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, I should like to make one comment, namely, that the amendment would definitely permit any man to go into a section in the West which had absolutely no wheat, as the Dakotas and Montana have, or into any other area which is now grazing area, and rip it up. In other words, the amendment would also make it mandatory that they do it in order that they might establish a wheat acreage. Much damage could be done to the grazing areas of the United States by this amendment because it is not confined to reclamation projects; it is not confined to irrigation; it is opened up to every piece of grazing land that lies between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains. That is where there will be tracts of land broken up that are now grazing land in order that those owning the land may qualify themselves under the act so that at any future time they will have the wheat acreage as a base and go back on some land that today would be adapted to wheat production. If a man had, let us say, a thousand acres of grazing land up on the slopes which had always been in grass, and 500 acres which he had been farming, he would go up and establish his wheat acreage on the slopes in order that he might have it to use on the bottom land when the time came that the act expired.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know whether I can yield to the Senator to permit him to ask a question, but I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wyoming for the purpose of asking the Senator from Minnesota a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUNT. If I may ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a question, does not the amendment provide that the Secretary of Agriculture is "hereby authorized"? It is at his discretion. The Senator understands, of course, that the Secretary of Agriculture is intensely interested in this piece

of legislation. I think the Senator from Minnesota is entirely in error when he is of the opinion that the Secretary of Agriculture is going to allow to happen anything of the nature he suggests. I call his attention again to the fact that the amendment is limited to 80 acres, so that it would be impossible for anyone to open up a thousand or five hundred acres.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, I should like to state that I recognize that it is confined to 80 acres to any one individual, but there could be many who could qualify under the 80-acre provision. The entire concern is, as the Senator stated last week, that what he is trying to reach is the limitation which has been established on a reclamation project, but he does not confine the amendment to reclamation projects. He opens up the entire West, wherever there is any grazing area that has not been subject to the plow for the past 10 or more years.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I cannot yield, but I should like to have the Senator have the privilege of replying.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Does not the Senator from Minnesota remember that when I presented this amendment to the committee, the committee was in great haste to report the bill and, with all due respect to the committee, let me say I think they acted very hastily, and did not give it due consideration. Does not the Senator distinctly remember that these other areas were incorporated primarily at his request because it did not apply to the people of Minnesota who might want to plant some acreage of land which had been cropped for timber?

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from New Mexico will yield, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that that is entirely true. He certainly would not approve any Member of the Senate standing and watching his own State's producers sacrifice wheat acreage to some other section of the United States. I merely sought to bring that question out in order that we might have full light on the entire question, and see how far it would carry us in the event such a proposal were agreed to.

I recognize that under the Senator's amendment we could go up into the brush land and plow down the brush land, open up an area that had not been cropped, and put it to wheat in order that we might take full advantage of the legislation the amendment proposes. But I am not so concerned about the brush land of my State, Minnesota, as I am concerned about the fact that we might re-create a dust bowl. We have far too much wheat acreage in the Southwest now that originally was grazing land, and we have endangered our grazing area by opening it up to a wheat crop during the war years, when it was so advantageous to do it because of the price of wheat. The combine and the great power that is available in tractors of all kinds made it possible to rip up grazing land in just a matter of a few

days. So we have opened up too much grazing land, we have far too many wheat areas in production today, and we do not know what we are going to do with the surpluses.

Mr. President, I fully sympathize with the Senator to this extent, that he is trying to cover producers who have settled on reclamation projects which are today new, but the Senator's amendment goes beyond reclamation projects. His amendment goes to every grazing area in the West. If this amendment shall prevail, I do not know where we are headed, either in wheat production or in tearing up the sod of the Western States.

Mr. HUNT and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like to yield further to the Senator from Wyoming to complete his statement. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota. I shall be happy to yield the floor in a moment, but I should like to make one or two more statements.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I think all his fears are entirely unfounded. We have all had our lesson with reference to plowing up pasture lands and grazing areas, and putting the land into new crops. We have all had that lesson in the West. We know it has been done in the past, but is not being done now.

Mr. THYE. If the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will yield to me, I would say to the Senator from Wyoming that we have had our lesson. Yes, we learned our lesson during World War I, but our memories were short. We as a nation found it necessary to plant shelter belts in the attempt to check the winds which were eroding the entire western area. But unfortunately, as soon as the rains came, and the dust-bowl condition no longer existed, we forgot the days of yesterday, and the plow again went out to turn under what nature had been able to heal in a few years. We turned the sod back under, wheat has flourished there in the past few years, and we are absolutely ripe for another dust bowl.

The entire Midwest yesterday was torn by a wind of from 60 to 90 miles an hour. If such a wind should ever hit the great Southwest again during any growing season of the year, devastation and destruction could again come to the land surface of that area. So for that reason I say that we learned our lesson, but we forgot it.

Mr. HUNT. I will say to the distinguished Senator that is not the case in my State.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I call to the attention of the Senator, in the form of a question, the fact that last year and the year before in the Northwest, we could break up lands for flax which sold for \$6 a bushel, and that under the law at that time the county AAA committee had to give consent before any land

could be taken for that purpose. Is the Senator from New Mexico familiar with that situation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Why would not that be a good provision to insert in the pending bill? Would it not prevent land which is not fitted for a crop to be broken up?

Mr. ANDERSON. I was going to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that he make some modification of the amendment so that if the Senate should adopt it, it could at least be carefully reviewed.

Mr. President, I desire to answer those who feel that the farmers will grant to any Secretary of Agriculture the right to determine what their acreage allotment will be. I remind Senators that the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate a proposal for a cotton-acreage bill, which carried a provision that there should be reserved 3 percent of the national quota for allocation to new areas, and, without a single exception, every cotton-growing State was against it. Each cotton State wanted to make its own allocations for new areas, and they compelled us to write in the provision that 10 percent should be set aside within each State. In other words, instead of taking 25,000,000 acres of cotton, or 21,000,000 acres of cotton, and saying that the Secretary of Agriculture could take 3 or 5 percent of that acreage and allocate it over the whole country, the cotton bill, as it finally emerged after long conferences with the cotton producers, contains a provision that the State of Texas can take 10 percent of its 7,500,000 acres, namely 750,000 acres, and put it where it wants—that is, for new areas and for new farmers.

If we were to vary from that principle we would arouse to wrath the farmers who have preserved these acreage allocations with great care, because they are a part of the value of their farms and they do not want it wiped away even though the situation the Senator deals with is worthy and deserving of consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from New Mexico now interpret the amendment of the junior Senator from Wyoming, which has been modified, to include the provision that there shall be a limitation of 80 acres to any one operator to mean that an operator can plant up to 80 acres of wheat, and then another 80 acres of corn, and then another 80 acres of something else; or does the distinguished Senator from New Mexico interpret the language to mean that one operator can plant only 80 acres in some cultivated crop? I think that is the point we have to determine.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to take it in the restricted manner that the Senator from Nebraska, I am sure, means.

I remind the Senate that the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] on the Senate floor a couple of days ago pleaded for the right to reduce the tobacco acreage from nine-tenths of an acre to five-tenths of an

acre. But under the proposed amendment a farmer could go into Kentucky and take some cut-over land and put in 80 acres of burley tobacco or he could go into North Carolina and put in another 80 acres of flue-cured cigarette-type tobacco. That applies all over the United States. If that is what the Senate wants, the Senate can vote for it. As for me, count me out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am deeply interested in this subject. When I rose I was thinking more of reclamation land which is going to be brought under irrigation. That is why I asked the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to define what he meant by "new land." I think the Senator will recall my question. What I am trying to do now is to find the interpretation which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, would place upon the modified language. I gather from the Senator's remarks that he feels the amendment means that only one operator can bring in 80 acres of new land, so there is no dispute about that. But the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico also stated that unless there is a further limitation to comply with all other limitations which are placed on such commodities as tobacco it is his opinion that it would nullify the acreage limitation in burley tobacco, for example.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; there can be no question about that. The Senator from Wyoming does not mean to do such a thing as that at all. I know he does not mean to do that. I am not trying to take advantage of him. That is why I suggested to him previously that if his amendment could be modified to provide for the case of new lands being brought into production in the year 1950 for the first time under Federal reclamation projects—I do not care whether they are brought in for the first time before 1950, because it takes a long time to get reclamation projects into operation—I would not be averse to having some such amendment as that go to conference and see if it could be worked out there.

But there are many problems which simply cannot be worked out. Today if one could have 80 acres without regard to limitations it would open wide the door to all sorts of abuses. While I grant that I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture would want to proceed in that way, I remind Senators that great pressure can be brought to bear. For example a man may say "I am a veteran, and I want only 1 acre of tobacco. I fought in France. Surely I am entitled to 1 acre of tobacco." What can be said to that individual? The Secretary would almost have to allow him the acre of tobacco. When such a thing is begun, in a very short time the whole tobacco-restriction program is broken down. Tobacco is already suffering by virtue of the tremendous increase in production and we no longer can make our limitations effective without cutting every large operator nearly 25 percent in order to get a 10-percent reduction. Those are aspects of this problem.

I am only trying to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who has first-hand acquaintance with the matter, and I know how deeply he feels about it, that he insert restrictive language which we can carry to conference and there try to agree on something still germane to his amendment. But do not make the door wide open and destroy farmers' wheat-acreage limitations of which they are proud. I know there was a time, in the western areas of Texas, when land sold for several hundred dollars higher if it had a cotton quota along with it. And if the law should provide that one can bring in some new land and automatically acquire a cotton quota by 3 years of planting, as would be done under this amendment, I submit that great violence would be done to the whole program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico if it is his understanding that the amendment or modification, which, during the course of the discussion my colleague accepted, the modification appearing at the conclusion of his amendment, constituting a limitation upon the area on which the waiver may be granted, and reading, "to the extent of 80 acres by any one operator for any specified product," means that the waiver is only for a total of 80 acres for any one operator, and that it does not mean that the operator may have 80 acres for every product he may desire to raise.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that my opinion would be worth nearly so much as that of the senior Senator from Wyoming, who is a lawyer. I am not. But if I were given the responsibility of interpreting it I would interpret it to mean 80 acres for any one operator for any one product. He might have a second product, a third, or a fourth. He could go as far as he wished.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am certain that my colleague did not intend that. The purpose of the Senator from South Dakota, who made the suggestion in the first place, was to have an over-all limitation of 80 acres, no matter what products were planted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then it should be limited to 80 acres by any one operator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to my colleague that if he would accept the elimination of the four words at the end, "for any specified product," and place a period after the word "operator," all doubt on this score would be eliminated.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for that suggestion. I am very pleased to accept it. I therefore further modify my amendment by deleting the four last words of the modified amendment, "for any specified product."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word or two in support of my colleague's amendment. I quite agree with him that the fears which have been expressed here are largely fears and are not supported by the language of the amendment itself. It has been offered in a good-faith attempt to

make it possible for new settlers, wherever they may settle, whether on reclamation projects or elsewhere, to have an opportunity to participate in a very small degree, even though they may not have had a prior history.

The amendment contains several qualifications. It refers only to new lands being brought into production for the first time since the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

There is an additional qualification that such lands must be lands "which have no production history." If they have a production history at any time they are not within the terms of the amendment.

Then there is the additional provision that the authority is granted to the Secretary to waive acreage allotments or marketing quotas. It is not made mandatory upon him. He must take into consideration the circumstances in each individual case.

The lands to be covered constitute only a minor fraction of the lands involved in this bill. There is slight possibility, if any, that any abuses could be practiced under the language of the amendment. That is particularly so because of the last modification which was accepted, which provides that the extent of waiver in any event shall not be more than 80 acres for any one operator, no matter how many products are involved.

Mr. President, I certainly hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the Senator from Wyoming agree with the Senator from South Dakota that, since this amendment would merely confer authority upon the Secretary, in all probability before granting a waiver he would confer with the local PMA committees and that local advice would flow to the Secretary?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Without question the law would be administered in that manner. This is not an attempt to grant a waiver with respect to the over-all policy. It is merely a recognition of the fact, first, that in connection with reclamation projects, for which the Government of the United States is making substantial appropriations, thousands of veterans are seeking to obtain authority to settle upon them. After having settled upon such projects, they should not be barred from planting the appropriate crop in the area in which they reside.

My colleague did not want to place himself in the position of saying that this waiver should be granted only to those who settle on reclamation projects. There may be those who are new settlers in other areas. Therefore the amendment should be stated in language broad enough to include them: provided, however, that it is clearly understood that these are new lands to be brought in since 1938, and that they are lands which have no production history with respect to any such product.

Mr. MUNDT. The aggregate is bound to be very small, since it applies only to lands which were not under production during the war years, when all farm products were extremely high priced. It

is certain to apply to only a small amount of acreage in the aggregate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that, if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will take the amendment to conference, he will find little difficulty in working it out in such a way that it will clearly mean for everyone precisely what has been prescribed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, not only could I not accept the amendment but I shall certainly insist upon the yeas and nays, because this amendment strikes at the very heart of the acreage system in this country.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rise to take 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate, primarily because of the debate on the amendment which we are now considering, which brings forcibly to my attention, and should bring forcibly to the attention of every other American and every farmer the situation in which we now find ourselves.

I am wondering if the American farmers and the American people, and we ourselves, realize that we are now debating, and possibly are about to adopt, an amendment which gives an American who owns land the right to cultivate that land, the right to sow that land to crops, and to make a living from it. Do Senators realize that that is exactly what it means? That is exactly what we are talking about.

Mr. President, I have been in every State in the Union. I know that there are literally millions of acres of uncultivated land, much of which should not be cultivated, and much of which should be irrigated and developed.

I cannot help saying something about the philosophy which we have adopted, of stopping the future progress of this Nation. Here we are, debating a little amendment, and trying to determine whether or not a man should have the right to cultivate or irrigate 80 acres of land and put it to crops to make a living from it. We certainly do not have the answer to the farm problem. I do not say that in criticism of anyone. But to curtail production, to deny a man the right to use his land to grow crops without coming to Washington for permission to do so, to me is simply un-American. It is directly opposed to the principles which have made this Nation the greatest nation in the world. I cannot help but wonder if the farmers of America and the people of America realize why this amendment becomes necessary under existing laws. I am wondering if they understand the situation.

I am confident that we do not have the answer to this problem, because if this amendment is necessary—and it is necessary—then we are saying to the American people, "You who own land and have a production quota are going to have a seniority right over all other Americans who do not own land, and a seniority right over all the land in America which is not now under cultivation, and over many tens of thousands of acres which are now in woods, as well as the many millions of acres which might well be irrigated, and which would be very productive." It makes me wonder. It makes me shake my head. I feel very badly about it.

I do not know whether I shall vote for the amendment or not. Possibly all Senators should vote for the amendment. Of course, I do not know that I want by my vote to deny any American, anywhere in the United States, the right to till 80 acres of land. On the other hand, I agree with the able Senator from New Mexico that the amendment absolutely will break down the workability of the existing agricultural law and the existing philosophy of our Government toward agriculture in America, which is a philosophy of regimentation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator what he thinks about the advisability of giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to waive the acreage allotments on one man's piece of land, but not to waive them on another's land. Is not that one of the things the amendment will do?

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps it will, but I doubt it.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to make my question clear, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The amendment now says that in the case of new lands, and so forth, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized—not commanded or directed, but authorized—to waive acreage allotments to the extent of 80 acres by any one operator. Does not such a provision give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to say to John Smith, "I waive the acreage allotment for you, for 40 acres of land," but to say to Tom Jones, "I will not waive the acreage allotment for you for any amount of land"?

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe that is a correct interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to say, in answer to the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that we must take into consideration the fact that the new settlers who have come on the land are without farm machinery. The farmer about whom the Senator spoke has his farm equipment. We must remember that when the homesteader comes to the land, the land is not level. The farmer about whom the Senator spoke is now using level land. The homesteader, when he comes to the land, has no fence around the land. The farmer of whom the Senator just spoke has fenced land. The homesteader has no home on the land, no barn, no stock. Yet at the present time he will be placed on a basis of equality with a farmer, perhaps in the same area, who has been a successful farmer over a period of years, and who not only has all the improvements and advantages which we have just mentioned, but also has a bank account.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator, does not it make big tears come into his eyes to realize that the farmers he has just described have to get permission to farm the land?

Mr. HUNT. Is the Senator referring to the ones I have just described?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am referring to the ones who will come within the provisions of the amendment, and to the idea that any man who owns land in the United States, and who may wish to till 10 or 20 or 40 or 80 acres of his land, has to get permission from Washington before he can till it.

Mr. HUNT. Yes, I do; and I think it is ridiculous that we invite ex-servicemen to take up these units, and we appropriate money in order to make irrigation projects available to them, and during the war the Senator from Indiana and I and all other Senators said, "Nothing is too good for these men, and we will do everything we can for them when they return"; but now we write into the bill a provision which will make it impossible for them to produce wheat on even 1 acre of land.

Mr. CAPEHART. But if we write the amendment into the law, we shall break down the existing allocation structure to the point where it will not work.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The very situation the Senator from Wyoming points out with reference to an isolated tract of irrigated land will apply to all other land in the United States. There may be in the projects veterans who will buy land which has tobacco or cotton allocations; but now the Senator's amendment starts to remove those allocations in order to clear up what I admit is a very regrettable situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I admit that the amendment possibly would break down the allocation law under which we are operating today. For instance, I have about 80 acres of woodland on my farm. Under this amendment, I would be able to clear the timber off that land and put the land into cultivation, and I would come to Washington and get an allocation for the 80 acres. I suppose similar steps might be taken in tens of thousands of cases, with the result that the philosophy of the law under which we are working today would thus be broken down.

But what I feel so badly about is that at the moment we have a system which places us in the middle, so to speak, so that although we should permit any American who owns 5, 10, 15, or 20 acres of land to cultivate that land and grow food on it, yet today he has to come to Washington and obtain permission to raise food on it.

On the other hand, we have placed ourselves in a position where, if we do permit him to obtain that permission, we break down the present system under which we are operating.

The entire situation shows that we in Washington do not have brains enough to be able to handle the problem properly. If we start out to do one thing, we run into complications in regard to other things. We simply do not have in Washington the brains necessary for doing a satisfactory job.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Indiana seems to place on one side the

veteran homesteader and on the other side the old-established farmer. However, that is not what I meant.

I ask the Senator if he understands from the amendment that it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to discriminate and distinguish as between homesteaders.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, John Smith, a homesteader, might say to the Secretary of Agriculture that he wished to be free from acreage allotments; and the Secretary of Agriculture could, under the provisions of this amendment, agree that he would be free. But Bill Smith, also a homesteader, might make a similar request of the Secretary of Agriculture, and, under the amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture could say, "I do not have to do it, and I will not do it."

Is not my construction of the amendment correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think so. As I understand the amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture could say to CAPEHART, "You may cultivate 80 acres," and he could say to the able Senator from Missouri, "You cannot cultivate 80 acres or any other acres." Under the amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture would have that power, if he wished to use it.

Mr. DONNELL. And he would have that power, even though in each case the person applying to him might be a homesteader. Is not that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; even though both persons might be homesteaders, and might be living on adjoining farms.

Mr. DONNELL. Of course, in the illustration I just gave, I was simply referring to a theoretical homesteader; I was not claiming that I myself am a homesteader.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand.

Mr. DONNELL. I was simply using that as an example.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, Mr. President, I am a veteran. I do not know whether I am a homesteader. I have done a good deal of work on the farm.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Under the amendment the Secretary of Agriculture will have authority to say to one person, "You can plant 20 acres in wheat," and to say to another person, "You cannot plant 20 acres in wheat." Of course, that is exactly the authority we wish to provide in this case. Naturally, the Secretary of Agriculture will consider the merits of each application. If an application came within the intent of the act, certainly the Secretary of Agriculture would have that authority. He has it now.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the able Senator from Wyoming this question: Does he think there is possibly one American today who realizes that such an amendment as this is necessary in order to permit him to put into cultivation acreage which now is not in cultivation?

Mr. HUNT. In reply, let me say that for 2½ months, now, I have been attempting to get the Secretary of Agriculture to say to me that these new settlers can plant so many acres of wheat.

He has told me time and time again, "I do not have that authority."

Before the Senator entered the Chamber I had incorporated in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter to a Senator, in which the question was asked, "Have you been able to do anything for us yet, so we can plant some wheat?"

Under the present allotment such a person can plant $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not know how I am going to vote on the amendment. I do not like the amendment or the necessity for it. I do not like the amendment because I think it would break down the existing system.

So I can only throw up my hands, shake my head, and say, "God help America, when, as a result of the existing legislation and of the legislation we are enacting, we work ourselves into the situation in which we find ourselves today."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree entirely that what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] has in mind is a worthy objective, and that he is trying to do something he thinks is fair for America and for the citizens whom he is trying to serve in connection with certain new reclamation areas in his own State. I wish it were possible for me to view his proposed amendment as an amendment which would apply only to a limited section of the country and to a very greatly localized group of people, and in a way which would not be disturbing elsewhere in the Nation.

It seems to me that the amendment very clearly is a mischievous one, that it leads to very great possibilities of discrimination, that it involves almost impossible, intolerable problems of administration on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, and opens the door wide to decisions which may conceivably upset the whole agricultural program and the whole structure of our program for price supports in America.

In my own State there is in one area, the Lake Okechobee area, a total of thousands of acres of land which has now been reclaimed, which has never been planted, which is now available for the planting of sugarcane, and which could be planted in such way as completely to upset the on-shore cane-sugar quota, at least I think its production could be of such volume as to be most disturbing to the whole sugar picture.

Much of the land is available likewise for the growing of various vegetables. I am thinking now particularly of Irish potatoes. As I told Senators in the committee meeting when this amendment, or one similar to it, was heard and rejected, I had just been waited upon by a committee of Irish-potato growers from southern Florida who had this precise problem with reference to drained lands which had just been reclaimed so that they could be made productive, on which about 600 acres of new production of Irish potatoes was being planted for this year, much of it by the veteran group to which the distinguished Senator has alluded. That planting in Florida would seriously upset the situation in that State, and the problem might become

vastly larger if, in addition to the 600 acres to which I have referred, further acres were so utilized.

Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment flies directly in the face of the knowledge we have obtained on the floor during the last few days that in some of the system of distribution and allocation of benefits, and acreage allotments, the acreage which goes to the various growers is small indeed. I remember that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] in his argument on the floor recently remarked that the average acreage in the production of burley tobacco in the State of Tennessee was less than 1 acre per grower. I do not recall the exact acreage, but that was his statement. My recollection is he said that more than 60,000 growers in that one State were engaged in the production of the one crop, burley tobacco.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). Nine-tenths of an acre.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer. My recollection is correct. Nine-tenths of an acre was the amount he stated as having been the average produced by each grower in that great State. My recollection is there were some 56,000 who are producing burley tobacco.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six thousand.

Mr. HOLLAND. Fifty-six thousand farmers are producing burley tobacco in that one State.

Of course, there are many acres of uncleared land within that State, which are available to be cleared and to be planted. There are in the State of Florida tens of thousands of acres of virgin land which has never been cleared or cultivated, which would be made available for the production of various crops upon which acreage allocations or quotas prevail.

Furthermore, Mr. President, there is hardly a piece of land in the Nation which, if it is taken up either by a veteran or by any other new producer, cannot be used for many, many crops which are not brought under the quota system, and therefore he would not be prevented from utilizing his acreage in an advantageous way. I think of hay and grass crops; of alfalfa; of dairy farming; I think of livestock production; I think of many types of vegetable production which have never been brought under any kind of support program involving either limitation of acreage or marketing quota, and which can be freely offered on the markets.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me the amendment would be mischievous in the extreme and might be destructive of many of the fine programs which are now under way, and that above all things, it would open the door to charges of discrimination which would be rife and which would be difficult to avoid on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture as he attempted to enforce and carry out this particular amendment. For example, suppose that, in his judgment, he should feel that in new acreage for the production of one crop he would be justified in allowing exemptions, but in new

acreage suitable for the production of another crop he would not be justified in allowing exemptions. It goes without saying that the individuals who were interested in becoming producers of the crop for which no leeway was given for new production would feel that they had been discriminated against.

Mr. President, suppose that, in his judgment, the Secretary of Agriculture should think that in one State there was justification for using the amendment, and in another State there was no such justification; and suppose one of those States was very close politically, and the other happened to be in an area where there had never been any question of what its political conviction was. It seems to me the opportunities for charges of discrimination and unfairness as between individuals and as between commodities and as between States and areas would be almost unlimited under the amendment, and that from the very beginning it would present to the Secretary of Agriculture an intolerable problem of administration.

With all due regard to my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, it seems to me he is asking the Senate to adopt an amendment which would be highly destructive of a program which in so many of its aspects has already shown itself to be workable and which is working well. So in my opinion, by no manner of means should the Senate consider seriously the adoption of the amendment as proposed.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I wish to offer a further modifying amendment. I wish to modify the amendment by deleting the figure "80" and inserting the figure "40", and, in line 4 of the amendment, following the word, "production" by inserting "on Federal reclamation projects."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, however, That in the case of new lands brought into production on Federal reclamation projects for the first time since the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1938 and which have no production history, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to waive acreage allotments or marketing quotas in the year 1950 and for a period of time not to exceed 2 years, to the extent of 40 acres by any one operator."

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, having offered the further modification, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment, and, of course, I also hope it will prove of benefit to the settlers on these projects. Let me assure Senators the amendment means the economic life or death of settlers who have just moved onto the projects. I hope the amendment, as modified, will be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as one who is interested in this amendment, now that it has been modified, I hope the distinguished Senator from New Mexico will accept it. There are many Federal reclamation projects in the Missouri River Basin which would be helped if this amendment should be adopted. It seems to me it is taken out of the cate-

gory of the argument which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. It was never my intention to open it up to change the historic basis of land which has already been under cultivation, turned back, and then brought under cultivation again. I did not intend that when I said I would support the amendment. What I had in mind was the very objective which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is intending to subvert. I hope the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, inasmuch as a concession has been made, limiting it only to Federal reclamation land brought in new and which has no historic basis, will at least take it to conference and see if something cannot be worked out which will be satisfactory.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I might add that the proposed modification of the amendment certainly makes it worse, because it confines the provisions to a very few States. The reclamation projects are west of the one hundredth meridian, as I understand. Furthermore, I should like to point out that the State committee in each State has an allowance in acreage to allot to new homesteaders each year and can take care of them in that way. Each State committee can assign the right to produce, if it happens to be a controlled crop. As I understand, the crops which concern the Senator from Wyoming are not at present controlled. I suppose he fears they may be controlled in the future. But I would not restrict it to new lands on reclamation projects, by any means.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, as modified.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. A few moments ago I stated that I thought the amendment in its original form was highly discriminatory. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Vermont that in its amended form, the amendment would become much more discriminatory, in that, first, it would apply only to a very small number of States, and, second, it would differentiate between the Federal reclamation projects and the State and district drainage projects which are found in so many States of the Union, in which, through the use of public capital and initiative, new lands are made ready for agricultural production?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct in his statement. The modification of the amendment, in my opinion, does make it more discriminatory than it was in the first place. I believe the State committees can take care of a reasonable number of persons each year and make allowance for new settlers.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I am very anxious to close this debate, because we have taken perhaps too long already. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I have limited this amendment for the sole reason that no one seems to object to the amendment

so far as it applies to veterans on reclamation projects. They object with reference to the cut-over lands in Minnesota, the brush lands in Montana, and the delta lands in Florida. No one seems to have any objection to the particular settlers whom I am trying to protect.

I should like to say, further, to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that, under the pending bill, the local committee does have some latitude, so much so, in fact, that settlers can actually plant one and a half acres of wheat. The Senator will agree with me that that is ridiculous.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I want to ask the distinguished Senator how large an acreage to one individual will be permitted on these reclamation projects. Is it 80 or 160 acres?

Mr. HUNT. One hundred and sixty acres is the amount a settler can take up.

Mr. THYE. The Senator would give a homesteader 40 acres. If he has 160 acres the Senator would give him that additional land. If he has 40 acres he can put it all into wheat.

Mr. HUNT. Physically he cannot, because he does not have the necessary equipment and the resources. If he puts in from 10 to 20 acres of wheat, he will be doing well.

Mr. THYE. Nothing in the world would prevent him from share cropping it and saying, "I will give you 50 percent if you will break the land up, because I want to get the acreage allotment." Equipment is available all through that area to break it up and plant it. I see a great deal of danger in the amendment.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator overlooks the fact that it is limited to a 2-year period.

Mr. THYE. But it establishes a base in that 2-year period with which we shall have to cope.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, as modified. [Putting the question.] The amendment is apparently rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. After the result has been announced, is it not too late to ask for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. After the result is announced the yeas and nays are not in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator is entitled to make that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any Senator can make such a motion.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum where there was no yeas and nays vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hunt	Millikin
Anderson	Ives	Morse
Baldwin	Jenner	Mundt
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Myers
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Donnell	Kefauver	O'Connor
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kerr	Pepper
Eaton	Knowland	Robertson
Ellender	Langer	Russell
Ferguson	Leahy	Saitonstall
Fulbright	Lodge	Schoepfel
George	Long	Taft
Gillette	Lucas	Taylor
Graham	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	McFarland	Thye
Hendrickson	McKellar	Watkins
Hickenlooper	McMahon	Wherry
Hill	Magnuson	Wiley
Holland	Malone	Williams
Humphrey	Martin	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming was agreed to.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand why the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has asked for a reconsideration of the vote. The vote was taken, it was taken fairly, the vote was counted, the count showed that the amendment was agreed to, and in all good faith I see no reason why we should reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and those in favor will vote "yea" when their names are called, and those opposed will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from

Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business with leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Jersey would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—42

Alken	Holland	McMahon
Anderson	Ives	Martin
Brewster	Jenner	Myers
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Downey	Kefauver	O'Connor
Ellender	Kem	Robertson
Ferguson	Knowland	Russell
Fulbright	Leahy	Saltonstall
George	Lodge	Schoeppel
Gillette	Long	Taft
Graham	Lucas	Thye
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Wiley
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Williams
Hill	McKellar	Young

NAYS—27

Baldwin	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Cordon	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Langer	Pepper
Eaton	McFarland	Taylor
Gurney	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Humphrey	Millikin	Watkins
Hunt	Morse	Wherry

NOT VOTING—26

Bricker	Eastland	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Flanders	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Frear	Sparkman
Byrd	Green	Stennis
Cain	Hoey	Tobey
Chapman	Kilgore	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Withers
Dulles	Reed	

So the vote by which Mr. HUNT's amendment, as modified, was agreed to was reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 17, after "wool", it is proposed to in-

sert a comma and the following: "Angora rabbit wool."

On page 11, line 25, after "honey", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "Angora rabbit wool."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this amendment provides for some assistance to perhaps the smallest agricultural industry in the United States. As a matter of fact, the breeding of Angora rabbits and the production of Angora wool is handled mostly by veterans, disabled veterans, widows of veterans, and small operators generally, who do it more or less as a side line. It is possible with a thousand rabbits to have a gross income of three or four thousand dollars a year.

I shall not take much of the time of the Senate at this very late hour on this amendment. I hope the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. ANDERSON] will take my amendment to conference and see if the small amount of assistance which this amendment provides may not receive favorable consideration in the conference. I assure the Senate that the need is desperate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is no question that the industry for which the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado has just spoken is entitled to some help. The difficulty is that this is not the way, in my opinion, to give it to them. The Angora rabbit industry does need some protection, but it needs far more a proper classification of the product.

It so happens that the January-February 1949 issue of the Angoran News, which is the official organ of this industry, contains the following statement:

We do not want or need a support price. Without an import tax, a support price would only bring in more imports. The wool can be produced in low-labor-cost countries at a price far below our cost of production, and to give a support price would only cause exporters in those countries to give rebates to the mills in this country who are importing from them. It would enable them to get more money for their wool, and since they can make a handsome profit at the present price due to their low labor, they could give some of it back to the mills and still be getting all they are getting now.

What we need is proper classification of Angora wool under the Department of Agriculture so we can get protection on Angora rabbit wool on a basis of Angora rabbit wool, and not on the basis of sheep's wool as the value is now figured.

I think that is a correct statement of the situation.

The Senator from Colorado is completely right in saying that the industry needs assistance, but a support price will not give it to them. During the past 6 months we received a tremendous quantity of this wool from Spain, Italy, and other countries. We cannot protect this industry in this country by raising the support price, because importers can pay the duty and still ship the wool in. I want the Senator to feel that we are all deeply sympathetic with the problem, and regret that apparently it cannot be cured by a support price.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the President have the power under existing law, or

under the amendment which was voted for here today, to exclude such imports if the Angora rabbit wool were under the operation of support prices?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator has asked a question which I cannot answer, but I think in fairness to him, and in honesty, I should say that I believe that if we had a support price the President would be in a position, under section 22 of the Agricultural Act, to bar imports which are causing trouble.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that in view of the fact that a remedy is available, the measure proposed by my distinguished colleague together with the relief which the President has it in his hands to give, the two measures taken together would solve the problems of those producers.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The President will have such power if the fur amendment, which is now deadlocked in conference, and which the State Department is going all out to oppose, is adopted by the conferees. The President will then have the power to rectify the situation. Nevertheless, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say to both Senators from Colorado that I certainly do not like this amendment, but I must admit that there is some justice in the suggestion so far as a fair price for Angora rabbit wool is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. WILEY] and myself, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, after line 18, after "potatoes", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "hemp."

On page 12, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

(3) The price of hemp of the 1948 and subsequent crops of the following grades shall be supported at the following prices:

Crop:	Price cents per pound
No. 2 line	20
No. 3 line	16
No. 1 tow	15
No. 2 tow	12
No. 3 tow	10

On page 12, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)".

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to tell the Senate, very briefly, a story which I believe concerns the welfare of the Nation. The story begins with World War I, and it is the story of a vital material, hemp. Before World War I this

Nation had never produced more than 9,000,000 pounds of hemp. We depended on importing almost all the fibers we needed. But, of course, when the war began, the German raiders immediately set out to cut off our supply of hemp as well as other materials. We found that if we were to prosecute a war, hemp was one of those unromantic and unpublishable materials without which it was impossible to do so. It was found necessary to quadruple our domestic production—and it was still necessary to risk and lose the lives of Americans to bring in foreign fibers.

The war came to an end and we promptly forgot about the unromantic item of hemp. Time passed—and nations quarreled—and in 1941 we found ourselves again engulfed in a world-wide struggle. Of course, the first thing the enemy tried to do was to cut off our supply of essential materials, among which were fibers. It again became necessary to supply our needs from domestic production. The Government found that a small group of patriotic and far-sighted men in Wisconsin had kept the hemp industry alive—weak to be sure, but alive. In this entire country, there were only five mills for processing hemp. They had been kept open, between the two wars, at practically no profit to the operators. But they had been kept alive, and the skills and knowledge necessary for producing and processing hemp were kept alive with them. In its hour of critical need, the Government turned gratefully to that small group of men. Government engineers rushed to Wisconsin to learn the techniques and equipment needed for hemp processing. Agriculture experts were rushed to Wisconsin to learn the necessary facts about the growth of hemp. The great hemp program was launched by the Government.

Forty-two additional hemp-processing plants went into immediate construction. Crops were grown in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. The planted acreage of hemp was increased 62 times. It took two full years to get the industry on a sizable scale. Had it not been for the tiny industry still operating in Wisconsin, the situation would have been impossible to meet.

Mr. President, our Nation narrowly escaped what might have been an extremely tragic shortage. I am sure other Senators will agree with me that two close shaves are enough. War has sped up too much for us to depend on having such good fortune again. That is why I bring to the Senate the news that we have again lapsed into a complete disregard of hemp. After the war, the Government declared the 42 plants to be surplus, and sold them. Only one is still used for hemp processing.

The huge surplus of fiber built up in accordance with War Production Board directives was dumped into commercial channels, and the spinners who formerly used the hemp-mill production, actually bought such vast quantities at such low prices that they are now sellers, instead of buyers.

The market for fiber grown by the five original companies in Wisconsin has

virtually disappeared. The industry has almost been wiped out. No one can deny that today the Nation is faced with at least the possibility of war; and unless something is done, it will face that possibility with no hemp, and even without the few faithful mills that kept the industry alive in the prewar period, and furnished the core of the wartime expansion. Mr. President, this is obviously the path of ruin and the course of madness.

The hemp-mill operators, now staring bankruptcy in the face, are asking that their product be given support prices. They feel, and I feel, that since other products are receiving support, this crop, because of its previous importance in times of emergency, deserves equal treatment.

I hope the Congress will see fit to grant this relief to the hemp-growing industry and to provide this security for the Nation. For that purpose, I am submitting the amendment to provide that the Nation stock pile a sufficient quantity of hemp to guarantee a supply in case of emergency, and a support price that very closely parallels that which was established in 1946.

I wish to call attention to the fact that in 1946 there was a support price for hemp.

I sincerely hope the junior Senator from New Mexico will at least take the amendment to conference, and in the meantime will contact the officials in the Defense Establishment and will obtain their reaction as to whether it is necessary to keep this industry alive.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I assure the Senate that it is no pleasure for me to come before the Senate, round after round, and oppose amendments offered by Senators whom I should be glad to support if I could.

It so happens that the Munitions Board has not placed hemp on its No. 1 critical list. Furthermore, I think it should be remembered that we have demonstrated once, during the war, the ability of the American farmer to grow the necessary amount of hemp when a situation demanding increased production of hemp arises. The 1949 production of hemp is only about 5,500,000 pounds from, I am told, approximately 4,450 acres. That is not enough in time of war, and all of us recognize that fact. I merely point out that the American farmers have in the past shown what they could do, for although in 1942, they produced 13,922,000 pounds of hemp from 14,500 acres, the very next year, 1943, they produced more than 140,000,000 pounds of hemp from 146,000 acres.

The farmers the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin represents were a great part of that effort, and they are entitled to an "E" award for it; they are entitled to full recognition for what they did. But the best way to proceed in the future, in my opinion and in the opinion of those who were very closely connected with hemp production during the recent war, is the way by which we proceeded the last time, namely, by incentives in wartime not by a very small support price in time of peace.

So I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the debate during the past week has indicated that there exists some confusion in the minds of Senators as to the position taken in the past by one of our great farm organizations, the National Farmers Union, with respect to flexible price supports. There would seem to be no good reason for such misconceptions, since representatives of that organization have testified repeatedly before our committees; and the attitude of the organization has been made public frequently through statements of its president, Mr. James G. Patton, and of its board of directors.

In order to clarify this matter, I should like briefly to indicate for the RECORD exactly what the National Farmers Union sought of Congress during 1948, the period when the Agricultural Act of 1948 was being discussed.

On April 15, 1948, Mr. Patton appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to testify on Senate bill 2318, the Aiken bill. Concerning the price support sections of S. 2318, Mr. Patton praised the work of the committee but added that "it should be possible to be both more creative and more realistic"—page 113 of the hearings. He then criticized the bill's support provisions on two principal scores, and suggested two major changes in them.

First, Mr. Patton said the level of support to be given a commodity should be related "to the production goals hammered out by the Department and the farmers."

Then—

He went on—

Instead of seeking to encourage or discourage production by reference retroactively to the production of previous years, we should be tackling boldly and with vision, the real problem, which is . . . to encourage or discourage production in the forthcoming year.

Next, Mr. Patton said:

Forward pricing should be given more emphasis in relation to next year's production goals so that get shifts within the total structure.

This, of course, is very far from a blanket endorsement of any kind of sliding scale. It should be noted, too, that failure of the Eightieth Congress to enact any agricultural law would have resulted in a reversion to the old Triple-A support levels, far under now proposed of then proposed. Moreover, in concluding his testimony, Mr. Patton had this to say—page 131 of the hearings:

Agriculture as usual finds itself in an extremely vulnerable position in the aftermath of war. Farmers for several years to come face a condition where failure to continue exports of farm products at very high levels would almost certainly bring about another and worse decline in prices of the things farmers sell. At the same time this could well be accompanied by continuing and even increasing inflation of the prices of things farmers buy.

Therefore, the National Farmers Union alone, I believe, among the major farm organizations, has taken the position that the support levels guaranteed in the so-called Steagall amendment to the Price Control Act of 1942 must be continued unless something were done to control the rest of the economy. In fact, we have advocated price control right across the board, backed by adequate credit control, for agriculture as well as for everybody else.

The enactment of S. 2318 or similar legislation would assist materially in quieting our fears. It would not, however, in my judgment, remove the necessity for strong action to curb inflation. We think both things ought to be done.

If, however, it appears later that it will not be possible for the committee to obtain favorable action on a satisfactory long-range bill, I appeal to it today to do all it can to obtain the extension for at least another year of the Steagall amendment levels of price support. In an uncertain world, there appears to be no other way available immediately to assure farmers against at least some of the worst effects of inflation.

In conclusion, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point, three documents which show conclusively the position in 1948 of the National Farmers Union. One of these is a statement of the board of directors of the farmers, adopted in Denver, Colo., on September 15, 1948. Another is a press statement by Mr. Patton, dated September 3, 1948. Both defend title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which extended the general 90 percent of parity support level through 1949.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL SESSION AGENDA

WASHINGTON.—National Farmers Union President James G. Patton today proposed a six-point agenda for the special session of Congress upon which he urged President Truman and Governor Dewey to unite. Patton's statement putting forward the Farmers Union agenda for Congress was as follows:

"The National Farmers Union urges President Truman, as the leader of the Democratic Party, and Governor Dewey, as the leader of the Republican Party, to unite in pressing for action by the special session of Congress meeting Monday on the enactment of the following six-point program:

"1. An omnibus civil rights bill, with cloture invoked in the Senate immediately upon the opening of the session to insure against a filibuster that will delay the remainder of the program.

"2. The remainder of a long-range agricultural program supplementing the long-range price supports adopted by the last session. This legislation should include a permanent land-use and conservation program, a strengthened and better integrated farmer committee system, and a nutrition program for low-income groups.

"3. Ratification of the International Wheat Agreement by the Senate.

"4. Adoption by the House of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as passed by the Senate, including the first comprehensive farm housing program ever seriously considered by Congress.

"5. Adoption by the House of the Federal-aid-to-education bill as passed by the Senate, another major piece of agricultural legislation, since rural areas would be prime beneficiaries of such aid and stand most in need of it.

"6. Adoption by both Houses of genuine inflation control legislation that not only will stop the present upward spiral of prices but will give a base for real full employment

legislation in the new Congress aimed at preventing a major economic collapse."

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

WASHINGTON.—In identical letters to Chairman GEORGE AIKEN and Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, respectively, President James G. Patton of the National Farmers Union today said the Farmers Union is solidly behind the present program of farm price supports and asked the cooperation of the two chairmen in getting the true facts of present conditions to the American people.

Patton transmitted with the letter a copy of a resolution to this effect adopted by the Farmers Union's board of directors. A copy of the resolution is attached to this press release. Text of the letter was as follows:

"In view of the continued distortions and misrepresentations of the farm price-support program and of farm income, I am sending to you with this a copy of a resolution which has been unanimously adopted by the board of directors of the National Farmers Union, composed of all of the presidents of State farmers unions.

"I hope that you may find some use for it in combating, as I am sure you will wish to do, the misinformation being so widely spread among the American people. As a true friend of farmers, you have always stood steadfastly for legislation that will benefit them, and I felt sure that you would like to know that the Farmers Union is solidly united behind the position stated in the resolution as follows:

"So long as the prices of all other commodities continue to spiral, and farm costs continue to mount, we believe that the 90 percent of parity support levels should remain. If this terrible spiral of inflation can be halted, then we feel that the long-range, flexible program provided in the present law, to become effective in 1950, can safely be put into effect."

"The fact of the matter is that agriculture still lags far behind other segments of the economy in income and that its real income is declining more rapidly than that of any other group. At the same time, consumers are receiving no benefits from lower farm prices and within agriculture itself depressed groups are suffering severely.

"For these reasons, I am making public this letter, in the earnest hope that it may help in some measure to bring to the American people the true facts of the present situation."

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION ADOPTED IN DENVER, COLO., SEPTEMBER 15, 1948

Farmers face the prospect of being put through the 1932 wringer again. We do not propose to sit idly by and watch this happen, and we denounce the campaign now being waged to undermine farmers' support prices.

To that end, we here and now declare our firm support of the present bipartisan agricultural policy and program, including the 90 percent of parity supports, and reiterate our purpose to fight to the limit during this Congress to retain it intact.

Most farmers are having very great difficulty making both ends meet. Prices received by farmers have been dropping steadily since January. Their costs have been rising sharply during the same time. Farm costs now stand at the highest level in history. With every month of 1948, the share of the consumer's dollar received by farmers has declined.

The facts should be made crystal clear to that great majority of the American people who are fair and open-minded citizens. They should also know that exorbitant profits are still being made by the great corporations and that processors and middlemen are refusing

to pass on lower costs of farm products in the form of lower prices to consumers.

We deplore the apologies of other farm organizations for present prices of farm products, and the present price-support legislation.

We resent the effort of former Gov. Harold E. Stassen and others to attack by implication, the farm price-support system, and to make a political football of it.

Those who are waging this campaign of misinformation against the farm price-support program should remember that the great depression of 1929-32 had its roots in the previous collapse of farm prices.

The Farmers Union, in waging its struggle for continuation of the present support price levels, is fighting for the best interests of the Nation as well as of farmers alone.

Farm price supports are not responsible for present prices of food to consumers. It is not farmers but some segments of business that are pushing consumer prices ever upward. We call upon consumers everywhere to join us in demanding that the Agricultural Marketing and Research Act be applied effectively to reduce the widening gap between prices on farms and food costs in cities.

American farmers have produced in the last 6 years staggeringly large crops, crops that helped to win the war and save the world from chaos and starvation. American farmers have made us the best-fed Nation in history. Without price supports this record of production would have been impossible.

If it should become necessary to spend considerable sums to support the prices of farm products, the Nation should do so. So long as the prices of all other commodities continue to spiral, and farm costs continue to mount, we believe that the 90 percent of parity support levels now in effect for most farm products should remain. If this terrible spiral of inflation can be halted, then we feel that the long-range, flexible program provided in the present law, to become effective in 1950, can safely be put into effect.

While standing firmly behind present price supports, we shall continue to work for governmental aid to improve the diets of low-income consumers and for a more comprehensive national land policy.

We, the board of directors of the National Farmers Union, have approved this statement of policy in session at Denver, Colo., September 15, 1948.

FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE AND PARITY PRICES AMENDMENT TO H. R. 5345

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which has been printed and lies on the desk. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. . Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as added by section 31 of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 773), and reenacted by section 3 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 (Public Law 879, 80th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 22. Whenever the average wholesale price of any farm commodity or product thereof is less than the parity price of such commodity or product, there shall be levied, assessed, collected, and paid, on such commodity or product when imported from any foreign country into the United States or into any of its Territories or possessions, an import tax or fee equal to the difference between the landed cost of such imported commodity or product and the parity price thereof.

"The term 'average wholesale price' for the purpose of this section shall, as of any date, mean the average wholesale price used by the

Bureau of Labor in computing the wholesale price commodity index (1926=100) current on such date.

"The term 'parity price', in the case of a farm commodity, shall mean the parity price as determined under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and in the case of a product of such a commodity, a price which reflects the parity price of the commodity."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, without an import fee to make up the differential of cost, we are placed in a position of having to support the price structure of the entire world at a level required to maintain our national income on a prosperous basis. The question before us is, At what level is it feasible to support such prices, and how can that be accomplished in a practicable manner?

COTTON, WHEAT, OTHER COMMODITIES

In my opinion, Mr. President, we cannot support farm prices successfully at parity without having some protection against imports from the low-wage-standard countries of the world.

We shall be forced into a position of buying up the products of the world, even though other nations starve. At the same time wheat, cotton, and other farm commodities will be stored up in the United States.

BUY CHINA EGGS—STORE OUR OWN

For example, in the debate on this bill, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] pointed out that dried eggs acquired by the Government under the price-support program were unsalable at \$1.26 a pound. He gave as a reason the fact that American industries using the dried-egg product could buy Chinese dried eggs at \$1.10 a pound. Thus, we find ourselves buying eggs from China, while the people in China are starving.

Another example is the demoralized situation in our fats and oils market. Net imports of fats and oils during 1947 and 1948 forced the price of fats and oils to drop an average of 15 cents a pound.

This drop in the price of fats and oils has affected every section of the United States, and directly affected the income to our American producer.

FATS AND OILS

Our annual production of fats and oils totals approximately 10,000,000,000 pounds. The drop in price of 15 cents a pound represents a loss of income of approximately \$1,500,000,000. This drop in price took place even though the European countries were desperately in need of fats and oils and were on a rationed level of consumption.

The effect of this drop in price of fats and oils, instead of promoting foreign trade, has destroyed it.

For example, we have a special agreement with the Philippines to bring in approximately 400,000,000 pounds of coconut oil duty-free. On a comparative basis with our parity price level, coconut oil should be worth about 30 cents per pound. At 30 cents per pound 400,000,000 pounds of coconut oil provided an income for the Philippines of \$120,000,000.

This income, in turn, represented dollar exchange and trade. The drop of 15 cents a pound reduced this income

\$60,000,000 and, in turn, reduced the dollar exchange in that amount and made it impossible for the Philippines to pay for goods imported from the United States or other nations.

In fact, the so-called crisis in Great Britain which led to the devaluation of the pound was a direct result of a drop in commodity prices which shut off both income and markets for Great Britain. Loans will not correct this situation.

If we really intend to help the world we must reverse our direction.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE AND PRICE LEVELS

Instead of permitting indiscriminate tariff reductions to reduce our price and income level to that of the rest of the world, we should maintain our price level and assist the rest of the world in reorganizing their exchange and price levels at a par with the United States.

NATIONAL INCOME

In 1948 we had a national income of \$226,000,000,000. If we permit our price level to drop back to 1941 levels our national income will drop back to \$103,000,000,000.

Such a drop in national income would force the United States into a depression and precipitate financial chaos throughout the world.

By using a flexible import fee as an indirect support for farm commodities, our entire support-price program would be greatly simplified. A flexible import fee at the parity level would automatically protect over 85 percent of our farm-price structure without any further legislation.

FARM INCOME

In 1948 our cash receipts in the sale of all farm products totaled over \$31,000,000,000. Of this total, 50 percent is represented by livestock dairy products, poultry, and eggs. An import fee at the parity level would indirectly support the price of these products.

Our principal exports of crops are wheat and cotton. The exportable surplus of the two items represent a total of approximately \$1,500,000,000 at gold parity values. This represents approximately 5 percent of our total cash receipts for agricultural products.

WORLD UNDERFERD

The world for years has been underfed and underclothed and a truly reciprocal trade program should make it possible to exchange these products so badly needed throughout the world for things that we may need to supplement our own economy.

In my opinion, a principal reason for poverty is lack of production, and low food standards in the rest of the world can be directly traced to the low level of farm prices produced by peon labor.

The real solution, in my opinion, for economic problems in the United States and the world is a level of prices for farm commodities and other raw materials at the American parity level.

Mr. President, the amendment does not cost anything. It may save the United States tremendous sums of money because, if we are to hold the parity level at any fixed price or at any flexible price, then the only way it can be so held is some kind of flexible import

fee to make up the deficiency between the landed cost in this country and the cost of the parity level.

MAY SAVE THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will see fit to adopt the amendment because I believe it may be instrumental in saving the entire program. If we start buying the products of the world to stabilize our own economy, it will cost so much money that there will be a reaction against the entire program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than 2 minutes to say that section 22 is one of the sections of the bill which farmers regard as being for their protection. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has been fighting hard to get an amendment through, and finally got it through today, that seeks to make section 22 operative. I only suggest to the Senate that the section should not be changed without giving the farm organizations and the farmers generally a chance to be heard. I think they like the section. I think they would like to have it in the bill. I agree with the Senator from Nevada it is not effective at the present time, and there may be cheaper and more reasonable ways of doing it, but until such an amendment can be presented at some time in a regularly scheduled agricultural hearing, and until the farmers of the country get a chance to speak on it, I do not think we ought to adopt it here on short notice.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico whether there is anything in the amendment that could in any wise injure a farmer coming under the act? In other words, whether it is parity, or a flexible sliding scale, or any other basis that may be adopted, is there any way in the world he might be adversely affected?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know, but I think the farmer himself ought to have a chance to come into a hearing to testify on it. I should very much regret having a serious matter of this nature—and section 22 is a very serious matter—disposed of without a word of warning to one farm organization of any kind that the matter is coming up today. I am not trying to say that by any stretch of the imagination the Senator from Nevada is seeking to take an improper or unfair advantage of the farmers; not at all. I only say it is a matter the farmer regards with some seriousness, and I think he would like to have a chance to be heard. I find myself unable adequately to answer the argument of the Senator from Nevada, because I am not familiar with the implication of his amendment, but I think the matter is of sufficient importance that it ought not to be quickly acted on without warning to the farm organizations of the country.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the Senator I have taken it up with the officials of the Farm Bureau of my own State,

and they agree it would not only affect the farmers in any wise, but probably would be a protection to them in the long run, in connection with the program, because of the fact that import fees would be charged, equaling the differential of cost; there would therefore be a minimum of imports and therefore the United States Government would only have to purchase the surplus materials raised in the United States, not the surplus materials of the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Humphrey	Millikin
Anderson	Hunt	Morse
Baldwin	Ives	Mundt
Brewster	Jenner	Murray
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Chavez	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kerr	Pepper
Cordon	Kilgore	Reed
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson
Douglas	Langer	Russell
Downey	Leahy	Saltonstall
Eaton	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Lucas	Taylor
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
George	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McFarland	Thye
Graham	McKellar	Watkins
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hayden	Magnuson	Wiley
Hendrickson	Malone	Williams
Hickenlooper	Martin	Young
Hill	Maybank	
Holland		

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I very much dislike to take even a brief period of time on a subject other than that of the pending bill, but today is the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the death of one of the greatest men in our history. As I say, much as I dislike to delay the business of the Senate, I should like to take about 5 minutes briefly to discuss this great man.

Mr. President, the cause of liberty is a strange and fascinating thing. Throughout history it has drawn certain men to its service and has exacted from these men such unswerving devotion that the course of history has repeatedly been changed by a few men, dedicated to the cause of freedom.

This Nation has been fortunate in having, perhaps, more than its share of such men. The cause of American liberty has time and again drawn the serv-

ices of men of other nations, and for these men we of America are forever grateful. Our debt to England for the services rendered by the pen of Tom Payne, our debt to France for Lafayette's great aid, have been amply repaid both in friendship and in more concrete manifestation. But there is one nation to which this country has done a great disservice. We have violated their trust, and we have violated our promise. I refer to Poland.

One hundred and seventy years ago today Casimir Pulaski died fighting for American liberty during the Revolution. His entire life was dedicated to freedom. He gave his fortune, his family, his home, and finally his life to the cause of liberty. The pages of history can disclose no patriot who gave more, or who gave more willingly. Because of Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and others, the American people have a long traditional friendship for the Polish people. Unfortunately the present administration does not seem to share in this high regard for Poland and sympathy for the cause of Polish freedom. The record of our foreign policy toward Poland is one of shameful cynicism and of complete disregard of both our promises and commitments and Poland's welfare.

The last war began because Polish soil was invaded. Through the Atlantic Charter, this Nation pledge itself to the cause of obtaining for all people everywhere four basic freedoms, freedom from want, from fear, freedom to choose one's own government, and freedom from territorial seizure. I do not think it necessary to point out in detail just how badly this promise has been kept in regard to Poland. She lives in fear, is wracked with hunger and poverty, has had a dictatorship imposed upon her, and has seen even that mockery of a government completely dominated by a foreign power.

What I wish to point out is that this supreme betrayal of Poland was not done without our knowledge or despite our opposition. The sad and shameful truth is that this Nation, at Yalta and at Tehran, deliberately and knowingly sold this ally, and delivered Poland to the hands of her oldest and most evil enemy. Bliss Lane, the American Ambassador to Poland, resigned rather than be a party to the reprehensible policy which this country followed toward Poland.

He felt that as an American he should be free to tell the American people of the betrayal of Poland. He felt so strongly about this that he resigned his position as Ambassador rather than deal with the Communist-dominated government which we recognized in Poland and wrote a book which sets out the sins of our Polish policy in great detail. It is a good book, but one cannot read it without being deeply ashamed of the manner in which this administration betrayed Poland.

It is, perhaps, too late to undo the great wrong which has been committed. But it is not too late for us to at least acknowledge our errors and to change our attitude toward Poland. It is not too late to begin to aim for eventual freedom for Poland. It is not too late to recognize that the Polish people are our

friends, regardless of what their Communist masters might say or do. It is not too late to reaffirm our affection and regard for the Polish people and our intention to support them in every manner short of war in their struggle. The cause of Polish freedom is not dead. The Polish people have a written history of 1,000 years of Christian influence and western civilization behind them. For a large part of that millennium they have been struggling for liberty. I do not believe the Polish spirit of liberty can be long subdued by the Communist hordes. It is my hope that this Nation will give all possible support to any forces within or without Poland that work toward a liberation of a great people.

On this anniversary of the death of the first great Polish American, we should remember that Pulaski fought for two things, the freedom of his native Poland and the freedom of his adopted land, America.

At a time when our own country's fight for freedom was at its lowest ebb, when the army of Gen. George Washington was little more than a tired and tattered group of men willing almost to forego liberty for a pair of shoes, a decent meal, a clean bed—at that time when the physical hardship of battling for freedom could so easily have crushed our spirit and our desire for freedom, a great Polish statesman, General Pulaski, left his country and offered his services to the disillusioned army of George Washington.

Like other Polish statesmen of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth century, Pulaski felt that when freedom was suppressed in one part of the world it was dangerous for the rest of the world. Pulaski could no longer fight for the independence of his native land after his military and political group was destroyed by the overwhelming forces of the partitioning powers of Poland. So he came to America to take part in the wider struggle for freedom, feeling that in helping America obtain her liberty, he would be fighting also for the eventual liberation of Poland. "For your freedom and ours" was the slogan of Pulaski and other Polish statesmen of his day.

General Pulaski's contribution to our freedom and to the American Republic which came about as a result of the Revolution, cannot be repaid by all the statues we have erected in his honor, nor by the great avenues which we have dedicated to him. Only in one way can we truly revere the memory of General Pulaski—by keeping the flame of freedom alive throughout the world and by showing the same great faith in freedom for which Pulaski gave up his life.

Today, when the circumstances under which Pulaski aided our Nation are reversed—when the heart of his native land has been cut out by an oppressor—we should demonstrate the same courage, the same faith in freedom which Pulaski demonstrated. We must denounce our betrayal of Poland at Tehran and Yalta.

The eternal striving of Poland toward the freedom of her own nation and others can never die. Now when the Polish Nation needs the friendship of this coun-

try—a Nation to whom she gave her friendship so readily and to whom she gave the services of her greatest statesman in the cause of freedom—we cannot continue to betray the memory of General Pulaski.

The Polish people ask only that we understand their plight, knowing that this country, once it is aware of the truth, will give its full-hearted moral support to the ultimate liberation of Poland.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6008) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 11, 21, 25, and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 26, to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 6008, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate. The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6008) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 8, 13, 14, 19, 20, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 28, 29, and 30, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to pre-

pare and carry out a program for the commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, as authorized by the Acts of July 18, 1947 (Public Law 203), and May 31, 1949 (Public Law 78), including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; Services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and such construction or other expenses as may now be authorized by law; \$3,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 21, 25, 26, and 27.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAM GURNEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KEER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6008, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
October 11, 1949.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 11, 21, 25, and 27 to the bill (H. R. 6008) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this account from funds of the constituent agencies such sums as relate primarily to functions which are consolidated in the Office of the Administrator as authorized by title III of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$125,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 26.

Let me state to the Senate that both of these are merely amendments changing the language so as to make it perfectly clear. For instance, the first relates to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator, for salaries and expenses.

I may state that the latter amendment involves purely a matter of language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 86, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 86) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
WILLIAM LANGER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TOM MURRAY,
HOMER THORNBERRY,
EDWARD H. REES,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

STABILIZATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5345) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "E."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

Sec. . Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That the amount of sugar heretofore determined by the Secretary to be needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States for the calendar year 1949 are hereby increased by 500,000 short tons, and the Secretary shall revise accordingly the quotas for such year established pursuant to section 202 of this act."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the occasion for this amendment has arisen because of developments affecting small business people, particularly smaller bottlers. Within the past week I have received a good many telegrams and letters complaining about the continued increase in the price of sugar. For the information of the Senate I shall read just

one or two of these as an example of the character of the complaints. The first is from Wynne, Ark., a small town in my State:

In spite of bumper world crops sugar prices have advanced while other commodity prices have lowered. Make every effort to get Secretary of Agriculture to increase both national allotments and quotas now by at least one-half million tons.

FRED RITCHIE,
Nehi Bottling Co.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, can the Senator give us an idea of what this man bottles?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Nehi Bottling Co. produces a line of drinks, soda waters. They are usually made up by small bottling companies.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they independent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are independent. Practically all these companies are small, locally run independents. There are only a few large bottlers, in the large cities. I shall come to a discussion of the character of the trade a little later. There are, roughly, 6,000 of these small independent bottlers in the country.

Involved in this question are not only the bottlers, but business people like candy makers, local confectioners, canners, ice cream makers, and the like. They are all in the same boat, in the business sense, in relation to the continued increase in the price of sugar. It is a very strange thing that while all other commodities, wheat, corn, cotton, and so on, have gone down in price in the last 3 years, the price of sugar has continued to rise. It has gone up this year; there have been two or three increases during the year. It is now at \$9.50 a hundred in the large centers, which is approximately twice as much as it was in 1939. From all I can gather it is likely to continue to rise, from the way the Sugar Act of 1948 has been administered.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator advise us whether the result of the amendment would be an increase in acreage?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to develop that idea. This particular amendment is in the nature of immediate assistance to the consumers of sugar, by directing the Secretary to increase the quota immediately. One of the major defects in the handling of the sugar question has been the administration by the Secretary of Agriculture. I must say I do not think that is the only defect. I think the act gives an unwarranted preference to a selected group. I see no reason why sugar should not be on the same basis with wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, and tobacco so far as support price is concerned. To me this is a wholly unconscionable preference which has been given to a relatively unimportant segment of agriculture, and I hope to say a few words about that.

At the time the bill was passed, at which time the Senator was present, there was practically no debate, and there was no record vote. The bill was passed on July 25, 1947, the last day of the session. I am frank to confess that at the time I had not the slightest idea of what the bill did and how it did it, and what was the effect of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did the Senator observe the Senators who sponsored the Sugar Act last year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am speaking of the act passed in July 1947.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did the Senator notice who sponsored it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I noticed a large number of Senators sponsored it. I assume they were all from States that produce sugar.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A very large number of Senators sponsored the bill. It was, quite naturally, sponsored by Senators from States which produce sugar, and a large number of States produce sugar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My complaint is that I do not quite see why sugar should have a preferential treatment over wheat, for example. There are a large number of wheat States. There are a large number of corn States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the Senator introduced any measure to change the Sugar Act?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I am speaking now of an amendment I have submitted.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That amendment goes merely to the increase of the quantity.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I have another amendment pending which proposes to repeal the Sugar Act. If the amendment I am now speaking of is not adopted, I wish to submit a second amendment to repeal the Sugar Act.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator is now dealing with the one which would increase the amount of the quota?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A matter which is within the present discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. I have just made that plain.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the amendment the Senator is now discussing is not adopted, then is it the intention of the Senator from Arkansas to offer an amendment to repeal the Sugar Act?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my intention to offer that amendment. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska. It will be up to the Senate to repeal the Sugar Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that act was worked out with the growers and the sugar refineries—at least that is true of my State and, I am satisfied, of States of the Middle West—in conjunction with the sugar growers in the largest sugar-producing States. Not only that, but I might say for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas it was worked out with the sugar growers of Cuba and the sugar growers all over the world that we would have a certain quota and they would have a certain quota. After all, I think the United States buys

most of the foreign sugar; at least the International Food Board makes the allocations. The Secretary of Agriculture sits on the Board, does he not, and if there is anything wrong he can do something to correct it, can he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly agree that the administration of the act by the Secretary of Agriculture is bad.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will also go further and say that the act itself is unjustified, because sugar ought to be treated just like the other basic commodities. Its total value is much less than that of our major crops.

I will risk boring the Senate by reading one other telegram just to give the Senate a slight variation of the type of complaints which have come in. This telegram is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

Despite huge surpluses of sugar the price continues to advance. Please use your influence to get Secretary of Agriculture to increase both national allotments and quotas now by at least one-half million tons. Ours is one of very few industries which have held price line. We appreciate the excellent job you are doing.

Signed:

"Jimmie" Sanders. Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. of Blytheville.

Of course, this industry is in a particularly bad situation, in that it is about the only industry I can think of which is selling its commodity at the same price, and of the same size it has been for the last 20 years, or 50 years, for that matter. Ever since I have known it it has been sold at 5 cents a bottle. That is all the retailers receive. Yet the price of the ingredients has risen. Not only has the price of ingredients risen, but so has the cost of labor. Of course, the industry has had to absorb those increases, as well as the increased price of all other materials.

The price of sugar has increased to them due to the very peculiar situation which has developed, as was pointed out, by reason of cooperation of the growers and the processors. How did that cooperation result? Through a most unusual act. There is no other act similar to it that I know of. Here is a commodity which was produced in 1948 of the value, in round figures, of about \$130,000,000. The per capita consumption of sugar in this country is roughly 100 pounds per person. I think the amount is 102 pounds per person. That is divided about equally between table consumption and industrial consumption. About 50 pounds go into the sugar bowl of the American housewife for table use, and so forth. The other 50 pounds go to industrial users such as those I am talking about. They are to a great extent small-business people.

The act has a very peculiar combination of methods of extorting increased funds from the public. We have here an act which imposes a tariff. We have an act which provides for payment of a subsidy to the producer. We have an act which provides for an ironclad quota, and which gives the power of enforcement to the Secretary, but under his administration the Secretary has not even

reallocated the deficiencies which have developed in the producing areas which, in effect, amounts to a decrease in the quota which was set.

As an example of how it worked this year, in December of last year the Secretary set a quota of 7,250,000 tons for this year, although in 1948 there was more than that consumed by this country. How it could be imagined that there would be less consumption in 1949 than there was in 1948 no one has been able to explain. I protested at the time, and a little later I want to put in the *RECORD* the letter I wrote and the answer I received showing, I think, how completely negligent those administering the act have been in doing so. Even assuming that the act would be workable if properly administered with the combination of power that is given the Secretary and the producers, I think it is the worst imposition upon the American people that could be imagined; not only upon the small-business men, but on the average housewife, when we consider the relative importance of this crop and what it costs the people of the country to protect and to enrich this small group of producers—small, I mean, compared to those who produce wheat or corn or cotton, or, for that matter, tobacco or peanuts.

As I said, I do not have all the figures. I know off-hand that the value of our cotton crop is in the neighborhood of \$1,500,000,000 to \$1,800,000,000. But here there was a great deal of complaint about an anticipated loss which we might suffer by the purchase of some cotton by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That loss has not been realized, because the Corporation made a big profit out of what it bought before the war. But we are dealing there with a great segment of our agriculture. Here is a little group of 55,000 farmers on only 1,000,000 acres of land, producing a crop valued at only \$130,000,000, for the protection of which this tribute is levied on all the American people.

I go back now to the character of this bottling industry. I happen to know something about bottling. I have a small interest in a small bottling company in my home town of Fayetteville, so I have some personal knowledge of the facts in this industry, aside from the information which has been sent to me. This industry is an example of that which is the hardest hit by legislation of this kind. As I said, there are approximately 6,000 bottling plants. It is an industry which is essentially one of small businesses, locally owned and operated, and which forms an integral part of the business life of the small communities. We hear much in the Senate about protecting small business. I have yet to run across a single instance when anything concrete has ever been done about it by this Senate. These small businesses, local in character, constitute an average productive value of approximately \$800,000,000 a year. That is around six times as important in the gross value of the product as the whole domestic sugar industry. They provide employment for more than 80,000 men and women on a year-round basis, which

is a substantially larger number than all the farmers who produce sugar in this country. They are the third largest customer of the glass-bottle manufacturing industry. That affects many industrial States. They are the third largest consumer of glass products. They are important users of automotive equipment, machinery, plant equipment, lumber and fiberboard products, petroleum products, textiles, printing, and advertising materials, as well as many other products of industries which are essential to America's industrial health and well being.

The products of bottling plants are sold through 1,250,000 groceries, restaurants, roadside stands, and amusement centers. For the most part, all those operators are small-business men and women, scattered all over the communities and up and down our highways. Many of them depend to a very great extent for their profit upon the handling of soft drinks.

Soft-drink bottlers traditionally sell their products at levels which permit the resale of the bottled drinks to consumers at an acceptable price. I think it is unique in industry in our country that the prices now obtained from the sale of their products are the same as they were before the last war or before the first war. Ever since I have known anything about the subject, the price has been 5 cents, and still is, for a bottle of Coca-Cola, Nehi, Grapette, Dr. Pepper, 7-Up, or what have you. The principal ingredient of a bottle of soft drink is approximately 2 ounces of sugar sirup. That is where this cost hits them. There has been a gradual squeezing out of all the profit. Hence the telegrams which I have received.

The price of sugar is now approximately 100 percent higher than it was before the war. It is the only agricultural commodity that I know of the price of which has been constantly going up during the past year. There was an increase in January of 25 points. There was an increase only last month, when the Secretary finally got around to the announcement of a revision of the quota which he had set last December. He waited so long that the effect of it will be very slight on this year's price. In the meantime the price has gradually climbed up until it is now, on the average, in the large centers, \$9.50 a hundred. In the smaller centers, because of distribution cost, it is slightly higher. I am informed that in my town it is \$10.

In 1948 the sugarcane and sugar-beet crops in the United States amounted to \$163,238,000, including a total of \$32,328,000 in cash payments from the United States Treasury to the growers. The value of the sugar itself was approximately \$130,000,000.

I referred to the official consumption estimate for 1949, which controls the flow of sugar to American consumers. That was set as long ago as December, at 7,250,000 short tons, or approximately 250,000 tons below the actual 1948 consumption, as officially reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I should like to place the quotas in the *RECORD*, and point out the fact that not since 1940 has the beet-sugar industry

produced anything near the quota which was given to it under the act.

The Sugar Act of 1948 recognizes certain areas and sets the quotas. The mainland beet quota was set at 1,800,000 tons. Never since 1940 has that point been reached. It went down in 1943 to less than 1,000,000 tons. This year it is estimated that distribution will be between 300,000 and 400,000 tons under the quota. The final figures have yet to be issued.

Mainland cane has a quota of 500,000 tons. In 1948 mainland beet-sugar production was 1,656,000 tons, which, as will be seen, is approximately 150,000 tons under the quota. The quota for mainland cane was 500,000 tons. The production was 469,000 tons. Hawaii, with a quota of 1,052,000 tons, produced 714,000 tons. That is, that much was distributed in the United States. Puerto Rico, with a quota of 910,000 tons, distributed 1,026,000 tons. The Virgin Islands, with a quota of 6,000 tons, distributed 4,000 tons. The Philippines, with a quota of 982,000 tons, distributed only 252,000 tons. Cuba, with a quota of 1,923,000 tons, distributed 3,124,000 tons. The quota for other foreign production was 27,000 tons, and the distribution was 98,000 tons.

Of course, when these quotas were not met by the producing areas, the deficit was allocated to Cuba. For the *RECORD* it should be noted that the difference between the 7,343,000 tons delivered in 1948 and the Department of Agriculture estimate of 7,500,000 tons consumption is covered by withdrawals from reserves on hand at the beginning of 1948. That is what is happening now. I have figures from the Department of Agriculture which indicate that these deficits, which the Department has refused to allocate to Cuba or to areas which have the sugar, are being made up and met by depletion of the inventories and reserves of the companies, so that we are approaching the end of the year with very much less sugar than we normally have in that supply. That is one of the reasons why the price continues to rise.

The record shows that mainland beet-sugar production falls short of its 1,800,000-ton quota by anywhere from 200,000 to 600,000 tons, and that the Philippines are still far from filling their quota. We know what has happened in Hawaii, which was one of the explanations for the decline in its deliveries.

The Department of Agriculture could see as well as anyone else that when labor trouble developed in Hawaii there would be a great deficit in the amount of sugar which could be shipped; but the Department delayed the revision of the quota. The first time it made any revision in the quota was on September 13, I believe, not quite a month ago, when the Department finally revised the original estimate. That is very late in the year, as anyone can see.

The mainland producers consist of approximately 1 percent of our farmers. The total number of producer beneficiaries of subsidy payments under the Sugar Act of 1948 was 55,702. The total number of farmers in continental United States, shown by the latest United States census, for 1945, is 5,851,169. The gross

farm income for all crops was \$31,312,000,000 for 1948. The beet- and cane-sugar acreage for 1949 is 1,062,000, three-tenths of 1 percent of the gross crop acreage for 1949, which is 353,000,000 acres.

The annual sugar bill for mainland United States is \$1,400,000,000. That includes a hidden excise tax of \$78,000,000, which is paid by the processor. It seems to me that those who are always talking about their interest in the consumer should certainly take an interest in the operation of this act.

On September 13, Secretary Brannan revised his original estimate of 1949 requirements, which he made on December 23, 1948, by increasing it 250,000 tons, which I think is approximately half enough. But this only brought the basic estimate up to the Department of Agriculture's estimate of 7,500,000 tons actual consumption in 1948, as I have already mentioned, although the Department reported on September 13, 1949, that consumption for the first 8 months in the current year had exceeded by 165,000 tons the consumption for the same period last year. Since then, as of September 24, this excess over last year's consumption has increased to 260,000 tons.

On September 26, the Secretary made two further reallocations of deficits. He should have made these reallocations at least 3 months before. He made one of 100,000 tons to adjust for shortage in mainland beet production and one of 200,000 tons against the shortage developed by labor difficulties in the Hawaiian area. These reallocations substantially cover the deficits anticipated this year, but increased consumption is still to be provided for. That is why my first amendment is entirely justified.

The Secretary's policy of releasing sugar on a hand-to-mouth basis—of keeping our sugar trade continuously "behind the eight-ball"—has naturally had its effect in Cuba which produced a surplus of some 1,000,000 tons above its marketing expectations. World markets proved stronger than had been anticipated; hence, the Cubans, impatient with our Secretary's policy, began disposing of this surplus in those markets.

At the same time our own sugar users, prevented from getting adequate supplies of new sugar, began drawing still further on the so-called invisibles or reserve stocks in the hands of industrial users, wholesalers, and retailers. The result is reflected in the USDA figures given in the August 29 report on invisible supplies. I have before me a copy of that report, and I shall refer to it in a moment. As indicated by the marked figures in this report, 1,037 firms had on hand more sugar in 1947, just before rationing was discontinued, than 1,400 firms had on June 30 of this year. Hence, our sugar "pipe line" has been so depleted that we have little or no reserves upon which to draw between now and March 1, when new sugar will start moving in from Cuba.

The two figures I have just mentioned are as follows: On June 30, 1947, 1,037 firms had 237,049 short tons of sugar, raw value, on hand. This year,

1949, 1,400 firms, or approximately 350 more firms, had on hand, on June 30, 235,765 short tons, raw value, of sugar, showing a very marked decrease in the amount of sugar inventory on hand for those reporting firms.

Mr. President, I have a very interesting letter from the National Association of Consumers, an organization which is not interested in the bottlers, so far as I know, but is interested in the ordinary, average housewife. I wish to read from page 2 of its field letter dated September 1, 1949:

3. Also at any time or times during the year that it becomes apparent that any of the producing areas will fall short of their respective quotas, he—

That is to say, the Secretary of Agriculture—

may reallocate such deficits to areas with surplus production, increasing their quotas by the amounts of such allocations. As all the domestic producing areas were given, in the law, basic quotas at or near their record production, most of these areas (and chiefly the mainland beet sugar) fail to meet their quotas by varying amounts year after year. Unless and until each of these deficits is reallocated, it is obvious that the total supply of sugar made available to consumers will be reduced by the amount of shortage outstanding.

How has this device worked in the current year?

On December 23, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture published his estimate for 1949 at 7,250,000 tons, or 250,000 tons below the Department of Agriculture's estimate of actual consumption in 1948. As of August 24, 1949, this estimate still binds the sugar trade in the strait-jacket.

Although sugar experts knew from experience and from field reports at the beginning of this year that mainland beet-sugar production would fall short of its quota by 350,000 tons and that the Philippines, still struggling to rebuild from wartime destruction of their sugar industry, would fall by at least 425,000 tons, here is the record to date of reallocations:

	Tons
January 8, Philippine.....	125,000
June 16, mainland beets.....	200,000
June 30, Philippine.....	300,000
August 29, Hawaii.....	200,000

This latest reallocation reflects the result of the protracted labor struggle in Hawaii and therefore will presumably effect no net increase in supplies available to the mainland. Thus we are now well into the third quarter of the year (the season of peak sugar consumption by both housewives and food-processing plants) with a supply for the year of 7,100,000 tons, or 500,000 below last year's consumption.

That was the estimate given in the telegrams I read a moment ago.

Since that was written, the Secretary of Agriculture has increased and revised his estimate, increasing the quota about 250,000 tons. My amendment provides that he shall increase it another 250,000 tons, in order to meet the deficit.

Of course, it may be too late. I cannot say whether it will be, because several letters indicate that the Cubans already have disposed of much of their surplus, and it is not definitely known how much of it they have left. But certainly we should take advantage of whatever supplies they have left, in order to meet the demands of this country.

Mr. President, with regard to the action of the Secretary, as I mentioned a moment ago, very strong protest was made regarding his action in setting the quota as low as 7,250,000 tons. The bottling association recommended that he set a quota of 7,940,000 tons, at the hearings that were held last year, in November 1948, I think it was. Vigorous protest was made at that time by some of the bottlers, but he ignored their protest, and again shortly after that, on February 4, I wrote the Secretary, Mr. Brannan. I ask permission to insert in the Record at this point a copy of my letter of February 4, and, following that, a copy of a letter dated February 28, 1949, signed by Mr. Loveland, Under Secretary, which simply brushes off the whole inquiry with the statement in substance that they know what they are doing, and that they stood by their decision.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been called to the complaints on behalf of consumers generally concerning the sugar quota of 1949, and particularly to the failure of the Department of Agriculture to reassign anticipated deficiencies in sugar-producing areas.

I understand that the major sugar using industries requested a minimum of 7,940,000 tons, but that you granted a quota of only 7,250,000 tons. It is also my understanding that the American consumers pay approximately 1.20 cents more for their sugar today than the world market, and that this restriction on your part is tending to increase the price of sugar very substantially.

I find it very difficult to reconcile the requests of the administration for controls designed to curb inflation on the one hand and on the other this artificial restriction on an item of such basic importance as sugar, with the objective of raising the price.

The bottlers of soft drinks in my State, and I am sure that it is the same throughout the country, are being very severely squeezed, and in many cases forced out of business by this policy. It seems to me that the deficiency should be reallocated at the earliest possible time. I also would like to request that you review the quota for 1949 with a view to raising it sufficiently to take care of the domestic demand without increasing the price.

I will appreciate very much having your views about this matter.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1949.
Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 4, 1949, regarding complaints received from your constituents criticizing the Department for maintaining a high sugar price, establishing the 1949 sugar-consumption estimate at the low figure of 7,250,000 short tons, raw value, and failure to reassign immediately any anticipated deficiencies in sugar-producing areas.

The Department is required under the Sugar Act to estimate the consumption requirements each year in December for the following year and to establish quotas in accordance with the formula in the act

based on such estimated total requirements. The act also provides for revision of the initial estimate of consumption requirements during the year in question whenever developments make such revision necessary. The Department continuously reviews data with respect to sugar imports, distribution, consumption, and demand and stands ready to revise the consumption estimate and quotas whenever necessary. To illustrate, the 1948 consumption requirements were established at 7,800,000 tons. During the year that estimate was revised to 7,500,000 tons, then to 7,000,000 tons, and finally to 7,200,000 tons. Only a little more than a month of the year 1949 has elapsed and it is obviously too early to draw any firm conclusions with respect to the accuracy of the initial consumption estimate of 7,250,000 tons.

In regard to the reallocation of deficits, it should be pointed out that the Department is required under the Sugar Act to reallocate deficits in the quotas for the various areas whenever the facts clearly indicate that such areas will be unable to market the total quotas established for them under the act. As a result 125,000 short tons of the 1949 Philippine sugar quota were reallocated in General Sugar Quota Regulations, series 11, No. 1, effective January 1, 1949, to Cuba and other foreign countries. The calendar year has just begun; production of sugar in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Republic of the Philippines is still in progress. Prospective deficiencies in the continental cane-and-beet areas for any calendar year are affected by the fall production and marketing of sugar by these areas. Later in the year it will be possible to determine with far greater accuracy the amount of any deficits from any particular area.

With regard to the price of sugar, we should like to call your attention to the objective of the consumption estimate, which is set forth in section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948. This objective is to provide a supply of sugar for the year at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry. The estimate of sugar consumption requirements announced on December 23, 1948, was made only after public hearings held on November 15 and 16, 1948, at which representatives of industrial sugar users and consuming groups, as well as representatives of the domestic sugar-producing groups, were given an opportunity to express their points of view as to the size of the sugar quotas. A copy of the press statement is enclosed announcing the 1949 sugar consumption estimate which indicates the Department's responsibilities under this act insofar as they relate to sugar consumption and prices.

While it is true that the wholesale price of refined sugar has advanced since January 3, 1949, from 7.75 cents per pound to 8 cents per pound, seaboard basis, it should be noted that this price is almost one-half cent less than the 8.40-cent price which prevailed in October 1947 under price controls. It seems apparent that if we are to have relatively large supplies of sugar that our food processors and civilians require, the price of sugar must be maintained at levels which are fair to producers as well as to consumers.

We hope the foregoing explanation will clarify this matter.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks my second letter, dated October 6, 1949, addressed to Mr. Brannan, calling his attention to these developments.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
October 6, 1949.

The Honorable CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As I am receiving many telegrams and other communications from industrial sugar users in my State, complaining about the current situation in sugar and urging an immediate and adequate increase in your basic estimate of sugar requirements for 1949, I have had my office assemble information on the subject.

This information would seem not only to justify the concern of my constituents but also to reflect a grave situation affecting sugar consumers throughout our Nation. I shall therefore appreciate any comment you may want to make, as well as an indication of your Department's basic sugar policy for the balance of this calendar year and for 1950.

I do not need to tell you that the industrial sugar users constitute an important segment of our whole economy, directly employing many times the number of mainland farmers growing sugarcane and sugar beets, and being heavy purchasers of glass bottles, wooden cases and cartons, advertising, etc. Unless they can be assured of sugar at a reasonable price and in steady and adequate supply, many of these industrial users (and especially the small businesses in our towns and villages) may be forced out of business with consequent damage to our economy and bitterness against governmental interference with normal trade.

Further, it is obvious that the housewives of Arkansas and of our sister States are equally affected through their purchases of sugar for direct consumption in the home. They may be slower to recognize the danger and less well organized than the industrial users to express their concern, but for that very reason the Congress and the administration should be especially conscientious in protecting their consumer interest.

What I gather from the information available to me is that we are now in the last quarter of the calendar year with our sugar supplies held to your own Department's estimate of actual consumption in 1948, although the use of sugar in the current year is already more than 250,000 tons above that during the first three quarters of last year. As a result, reserve stocks in the "pipe line" of refiners, industrial users, wholesalers, and retailers have been drawn down substantially below the reserves which were considered essential for an orderly distribution of sugar when rationing was still officially in effect. I understand further that because of the sugar-control policy which has been in effect so far this year Cuban producers have become so discouraged and impatient that much of their surplus sugar, which we have traditionally called on to help us through tight situations, has already been disposed of in world markets. Now that we need it badly, it just isn't there.

Finally, I am told that it is not sufficient so to plan our sugar-control policy as to squeak through this calendar year. With the Cuban surplus, which was estimated at 1,000,000 tons at the beginning of this year, all but dissipated in world markets, there may not be sufficient carry-over to fill our normal sugar needs in January and February, the "dead" months before Cuba's new crop begins to reach our markets.

Apparently we are faced with these alternatives: Either we must act promptly through an adequate increase in the basic estimate to permit our mainland refiners to buy such raw sugar as still may be available in Cuba

or the President will have to suspend all sugar quotas, as was done in the wartime emergency. To have to resort to this latter alternative in a year of peace when world sugar production has reached an all-time high of more than 37,000,000 tons would reflect a complete break-down in the administration of the Sugar Act. I am confident that you will do everything in your power to prevent such a development.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a rather mysterious thing to me why in the face of the developments in Hawaii, which are well known, and in fact, in the face of the well-known facts of the situation in the Philippines, that he was so slow in making these reallocations of the deficits.

In this connection I ran into what I think was rather interesting information. It may have significance. I certainly think it is worth while calling it to the attention of the Senate, not only in the consideration of the amendment but in the consideration of the Sugar Act as a whole. All Senators who have been in the Senate for any length of time are quite familiar with former Representative Flannagan, who was chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the House. He was from Virginia. I am quoting from a summary of his statement made on July 10, 1947, shortly before the passage of the present Sugar Act. The statement is found in volume 93, part VII of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 8636. I think it is very pertinent as to how the original act was passed. I mentioned a moment ago that if Senators will look in the RECORD of July 25, 1947, they will see there was very little debate on the entire act. There was no yeay-and-nay vote. It was passed by a voice vote. There was no division. I am frank to say I had not the slightest idea what the bill was, or of what it did. It was announced that everyone was in agreement, it was a fine bill, and there was no objection. I can well understand that anyone who has the slightest interest in the sugar industry would not object to this bill, because there is nothing comparable with the Sugar Act to be found in our laws, in the way it protects, subsidizes, and supports the sugar industry. There is nothing concerning any other industry comparable with it. I cannot of course testify as to its accuracy, but this is a brief statement of what the chairman of the Agricultural Committee said, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Robert Shields, then Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, wrote the bill which became the Sugar Act of 1948. He resigned (before the bill was passed) and went to work for the United States Beet Sugar Association at a reputed salary of \$40,000 per year. He took along with him, at \$18,000 per year one H. B. Boyd, a member of the Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, who, with Shields (as another member) had voted to make an award of \$1,500,000 to the Sugar Trust, under a contract with CCC covering the 1943 crop, after the then Economic Stabilizer, Byrns, had turned it down. Also one Dennis O'Rourke, then in the Solicitor's office, Department of Agriculture, wrote an opinion upholding the claim of the

Sugar Trust. He was also taken care of by one of the Sugar companies.

Earl Wilson, while drawing a salary of \$25,000 a year as vice president of the National Sugar Refining Co., also was connected with the Sugar Branch of both the CCC and the Department of Agriculture. Secretary Anderson found out about this, referred the question to Shields, who was then solicitor, for an opinion. Shields took up the question with Justice, which ruled he could not draw both salaries. Wilson then relinquished his salary from the company and went to work for the Department until the latter part of 1946. Today I am told he is drawing \$50,000 per year as an official of the California-Hawaiian Sugar Refining Co.

There was also inserted in the report of the committee the reply by Secretary Brannan to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy], who had made inquiry about the act. I quote from the Secretary's answer to the Senator; taken from last year's hearings on inflation control legislation before the Banking and Currency Committee:

REPLY TO INQUIRY OF SENATOR M'CARTHY BY
SECRETARY BRANNAN

The original determination of the amount of sugar needed to meet requirements of consumers in the continental United States during the year 1948 was made by Secretary of Agriculture CLINTON P. ANDERSON on January 2, 1948. The amount was 7,800,000 short tons. At that time Mr. James H. Marshall was Director of the Sugar Branch, Production and Marketing Administration of the Department. On February 26, 1948, this estimate was revised. The revised estimate was 7,500,000 short tons. At that time CLINTON P. ANDERSON was Secretary of the Department and Mr. James H. Marshall was Director of the Sugar Branch. On May 25, 1948, the estimate was again revised. The second revision placed the estimate at 7,000,000 short tons. At this time Mr. N. E. Dodd was Acting Secretary of Agriculture and Mr. Lawrence was Acting Director of the Sugar Branch.

Mr. James H. Marshall left the Department on April 3, 1948, to enter the employ of the California-Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp. with headquarters at San Francisco. I have no information regarding his salary.

That ends the quotation of Mr. Brannan's reply. But those little statements certainly indicate there was strong pressure in the Department, aside from the Office of the Secretary, which influenced the quotas which we see starting at 7,800,000 short tons, reduced to 7,000,000. Although the consumption of sugar was 7,500,000 tons.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of all the people I have been associated with in the Department of Agriculture, I know no individual whose sense of integrity was higher than that of Earl Wilson, who was head of the Sugar Branch. He left a very fine job at \$25,000 a year to serve during the war at \$9,000 a year, when his personal financial resources were very thin. He left the Department to return to private business, expecting to resume his former position. It was, I think, my own urging that prevailed upon him to announce to the trade that he was returning to private business. He was swamped with offers from companies of all kinds, and finally he accepted one in excess of \$50,000.

As to James Marshall: three distinguished American companies tried to obtain his services. He finally took a salary at much less than the salary offered him by another company, to go with Mr. Wilson, because he admired him so greatly. Mr. Marshall's health was so shattered by the work he did in the Department of Agriculture, working night after night, late at night, at \$7,000 and then at \$8,000 a year, that he was unable to assume his duties with the new company for nearly a year after he went into its employ. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Marshall are two of the finest men I have ever known in my life.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I do not know any of the persons individually. These are circumstances which the chairman of the committee drew to the attention of the House. I do not think the association of those occurrences in the allocations and legislation referred to necessarily proves that anyone has done anything criminal or open to censure from a legal or ethical point of view. There has been a similar problem in the RFC. There were cases in which persons who had participated in the granting of loans in very large amounts took positions with firms which had received the loans. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad was one instance. No one said it violated any practice at all, but there was a feeling left in the minds of certain persons that it was not quite the proper thing to do, when a railroad had been loaned \$80,000,000, for the person who was instrumental in connection with the loan to take a position at three or four times his previous salary. The Senate recently passed a bill prohibiting that sort of thing. It is no reflection upon the honesty and integrity of the persons who, prior to this time, have done it, because it has been an accepted practice. There were several instances at RFC, but none of the persons involved could be said to have violated any regulation or rule.

It is true that there grows up an association in the process of making a loan or setting a quota. I am not interested in condemning those individuals. I am seeking to condemn a law which places a wholly arbitrary power in the Secretary of Agriculture. It has been exercised arbitrarily this year and has resulted in a most peculiar and evil situation with regard to the American consumer. It involves a small item, overall, although it amounts to \$1,400,000,000 in the total cost to the country. It may be that the housewife does not worry about it very much, but it is all out of reason when one considers what a small segment of agriculture is being subsidized.

I have no idea of saying that sugar should not be protected. I do say that it should not be protected any more than is any other of our basic crops. I am quite unable to see how it deserves to stand quite apart from every other kind of agricultural product and be hedged about with tariffs, subsidies, and quotas. I am frank to say that I was not conscious of the situation until I received complaints and began to look into the way in which it is operating. I think the

Secretary should not have such power over the selling price of sugar. If a support price comparable to that of wheat could be justified, I should be for it. But I think we are paying a big price to protect 1 percent of our farmers in this program.

Mr. President, I do not wish to proceed much further. However, I want to call attention to one or two items. Cannery use large amounts of sugar. There are many small cannery as well as large ones in nearly every State in the Union who are hit by this bill. In addition to that, I have some bulletins showing the impact upon other fields of agriculture.

My State, along with some others, happens to export rice to Cuba. Cuba is probably the largest single purchaser of rice from the United States. I wish to read from the bulletin for September, 1949, of the United States Cuban Sugar Council:

Texas, as the second largest rice-producing State, ordinarily providing about 25 percent of the total grown in this country, has an interest in Cuba's purchases of rice.

Rice exports from the United States to Cuba in 1948 were valued at \$43,000,000 and in 1947 at \$74,000,000, about 50 percent of the total value of all rice exports from this country in 1948 and 81 percent in 1947.

Rice exports to all countries in 1948 amounted to about one-third of the total United States crop and in 1947 to 41 percent. Exports to Cuba constituted 17 percent of the crop in 1948 and 32 percent in 1947.

The sum of \$43,000,000 is approximately one-third of the total value of all the sugar produced in the United States. The farmers in that field have an interest. We cannot disassociate this one problem from any of the others. I think it has a harsh impact upon our whole agricultural program to treat this particular crop in this highly preferential manner.

I am told that in Florida, in 1948, Cuban tourists spent \$70,000,000, a sum almost equal to the total value of the Florida citrus crop in good years. That statement is from the general counsel of the United States Cuban Sugar Council. I should like to quote another sentence from his letter:

Similarly, while one hears constantly of the Louisiana sugarcane production, the Cuban purchases of rice from that State seem generally to be lost sight of.

The exports of other agricultural products to Cuba are, of course, directly dependent upon the purchases of sugar from Cuba. If we establish quotas in an effort to try to force an artificially high production of sugar in this country, we get caught in the back-lash.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to insert in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from the New York Times of Friday, November 19, 1948, which gives a fairly good description of the act. It is entitled "The Sugar Act Farce."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUGAR ACT FARCE

This week the Sugar Branch of the Department of Agriculture conducted hearings to which it invited all persons interested in

the determination of next year's consumption requirements for the United States.

Under the Sugar Act of 1948 the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to make such an estimate some time during December. Domestic producers are guaranteed a minimum quota of 1,800,000 tons, and on the basis of the estimate of probable total demand the Secretary decides what the import quotas will be for the year. Among the considerations which he is instructed to keep in mind are: The level of consumption of sugar this year; whether there is a current deficiency or surplus of sugar inventories; current trends in population and consumer demand, and the cost of living today compared with that of 1947. There is also an officially stated warning from Congress that the resulting quota figure must "protect the welfare of consumers" by insuring prices that are not excessive, but must also protect the welfare of the domestic sugar-producing industry.

The hearings this week testify to the fantastic character of the Agriculture Department's assignment under the contradictory provisions of this act. It also corroborates a prediction we made here when the law was under debate more than a year ago. The Department, we then pointed out, would find itself under constant pressure to arrive at consumption estimates which would result in artificial shortage of sugar, thus deliberately squeezing the Nation's consumers by a rise in prices for the benefit of a few thousand domestic producers.

A year ago CLINTON P. ANDERSON, then Secretary of Agriculture, estimated American sugar consumption for 1948 at 7,800,000 tons. This forecast was subsequently revised three times, finally coming to rest at 7,200,000 tons. Deliveries of newly produced sugar this year will come to just about 7,200,000 tons, but it is estimated that consumption from invisible sources accounted for an additional 400,000 to 450,000 tons. That would mean an indicated total consumption for 1948 of 7,600,000 tons or thereabout.

There is nothing in the potential-demand situation to suggest that the country won't require at least as much sugar in 1949 as it did in 1948. Representatives of consumer groups maintain that the consumption figure should be set at 8,000,000 to 8,500,000 tons if household needs and the needs of industrial users for current consumption and inventory rebuilding are to be met. Doubtless those figures can be regarded as somewhat on the generous side. But what do the producers have to say? They demand that the consumption figure be set at around 6,900,000 to 7,000,000 tons. But here is the interesting point. They don't even pretend that they are arguing for this estimate because it represents the country's probable sugar requirements. They say frankly that they are proposing it because it would have the effect of raising the price of refined sugar from the present level of 7.75 cents a pound to around 9.15 cents. In other words, the Government is being called upon to bring out an estimate of the country's sugar needs that is arbitrarily manipulated in order that a handful of producers may profit from the artificial shortage thus created.

One might be tempted under ordinary circumstances to say that it is not the sugar interests who are to blame in this case but the legislation which encourages such action on their part. Unfortunately, however, this law happens to be the handiwork of the domestic sugar industry itself, including the representatives of the producers. So, if the latter are taking advantage of provisions of the law which require the Government to safeguard their welfare and consider living-cost changes, they are simply relying upon provisions which they themselves wrote into it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, much as I dislike to disagree with my distinguished friend from Arkansas, I rise in opposition to his amendment. We passed the Sugar Act in 1948, and as I recall, there was no particular objection at that time. I have always considered the Sugar Act of 1948 a rather fine piece of legislation.

Under this proviso we find that the amount of sugar heretofore determined by the Secretary to meet the requirements of consumers in continental United States for the calendar year 1949 will be increased approximately 500,000 short tons.

Mr. President, this is an important amendment. It is the kind of an amendment which should be studied most seriously, after hearing experts upon the question. The committee to which an amendment of this kind should be referred is the Finance Committee. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas is offering an amendment of this kind without any hearings whatsoever before the Finance Committee, and it seems to me to be unwise and improper. In discussing the Magnuson amendment a few days ago my good friend had this to say, which definitely clinches the argument, so far as I am concerned, by the Senator's own words. He said, in reply to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the following, among other things:

I oppose the amendment on two or three grounds. My first ground is that I do not think a matter which is so important as this one should be brought in at the last moment in connection with an agricultural bill without having been examined very closely and considered by the proper committee, which, in my opinion, would be the Finance Committee, dealing with our reciprocal trade agreements.

The Senator from Arkansas was absolutely correct in making that statement, in my opinion. I think his argument with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington applies equally to the pending amendment, because it is of tremendous importance not only to the consumers, but the sugar-beet growers, the cane growers, and all others who produce sugar in this country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senate did not agree with my position, and very decidedly overruled it and adopted the Magnuson amendment. I have been voted out of court on that position.

Speaking of the amendment now pending, it does not in any way change existing law. It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to perform an administrative act which he should have performed, in my opinion, at least 3 months ago. It would have no permanent effect upon the legislation, or his power. It merely says for him to do something which I think nearly every consumer believes he should have done long ago.

The president of the Sugar Refiners' Association was here last week apologizing for the way the law had been administered. He is very strong for the act, but he recognizes those administering it have been derelict in their duty in meeting the situation, particularly in

recognizing the situation which developed in Hawaii due to the strike.

The remarks with reference to the Reciprocal Trade Act would not apply to the pending amendment. They might apply to the one which would repeal the act, which is a little more drastic than the first amendment.

During the delivery of Mr. FULBRIGHT'S speech,

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that members of the Committee on Appropriations be excused from attendance on the session immediately, for a special meeting in the office of the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I understand the argument of the Senator from Arkansas, but it still does not convince me that he is not slightly inconsistent in the position he took the other day before the Senate and the one he is now taking. There is nothing too unusual about Senators being inconsistent in matters at different times, and I do not particularly hold that against my able friend, the Senator from Arkansas, but he did make a very strong and impelling argument on the previous occasion, and it was due primarily to his argument that the Magnuson amendment was defeated by one or two votes. We were overpowered today, because many of our colleagues were absent, and it was too bad. Nevertheless, the argument the Senator made in the early part of the debate, which led to the defeat to the Magnuson amendment, still holds good. I congratulate him on the argument now, especially with respect to the importance of that amendment being considered by the Finance Committee.

The pending amendment is equally important, as I know from my experience in the committee meetings where sugar quotas and allotments have been under consideration. Whenever there is a sugar bill before the Committee on Finance, plenty of people in Washington come forward and tell exactly what should be done with respect to the allotments and the quotas, how they should be handled, the way they should be increased, and the like. I do not know anything about how the Secretary of Agriculture has been administering the act; I have not followed it because my State is not in the sugar-producing territory, but perhaps some of the complaints the able Senator from Arkansas makes would justify the adoption of this amendment directing the Secretary's attention to the facts, and he may be able to correct the practice complained of. Certainly, however, under no circumstances should the Senate adopt this amendment on a farm bill so important as the one now before the Senate.

Mr. President, it is this kind of an amendment which is likely to defeat the farm bill. If Senators are truly interested in a farm bill, they had better stick to the text of the original farm bill

as reported by the Senate committee, so that we can go to conference with amendments which are absolutely germane and really come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my second amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following new section:

SEC. . The Sugar Act of 1948 is hereby repealed effective December 31, 1949.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not intend to reiterate the arguments I have made. If it is impossible to get the Senate to instruct the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the law as it should be administered, and if he insists upon so administering it as to run the price of sugar up, apparently endlessly, because the price continues to move up, I think the act should be repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there is an amendment before the Senate which proposes price supports for beef, pork, poultry, eggs, and turkeys. My colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], also offered an amendment embodying practically the same commodities under a similar price-support program.

I honestly feel that this amendment is a sound and reasonable one, for supports on the basic commodities such as wheat, corn, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco do not particularly benefit the diversified agricultural areas, and Minnesota is definitely a diversified agricultural State. There the dairy products, poultry and eggs, as well as pork, are predominant, and while we do receive some benefit from price-support legislation regarding wheat, and likewise corn, yet those are not large income-producing commodities in the State as are dairy products, eggs, and poultry, and unless poultry, eggs, turkeys, and pork—and I would say we are definitely interested in beef—are supported by a support program, the diversified agricultural sections of the United States, which of course definitely include Minnesota, are not going to receive much benefit from price support.

Mr. President, the producers of eggs in the Northwest are in distress at the present time, and have been in distress all summer. The producers of dairy products last spring were in distress up until those of us representing the Midwest, and the diversified area of the agricultural belt of the Nation contacted the Secretary of Agriculture and insisted that the Commodity Credit Corporation make purchases of butter and powdered milk in order to support the dairy price

in the areas where the farmers are dependent on either the manufacture of butter or the powdering of their skimmed milk as a marketable outlet. Up until the time the Commodity Credit Corporation made those purchases, the dairy prices were slipping month by month.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota whether his term "poultry" includes ducks.

Mr. THYE. We may have to refer to the dictionary to make certain what the interpretation of that term would be by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. IVES. If there be some question about it, would the distinguished Senator from Minnesota be willing to modify his amendment by the inclusion of the word "ducks"?

Mr. THYE. I should have no objection, and I could see no reason for objecting, if there is an area in the United States where ducks are grown to any great extent. I should say those who raise ducks would be in distress in the same manner as those who raise poultry.

Mr. IVES. That is correct. That is the reason the Senator from New York has an interest in this particular amendment, if it is going to be adopted. New York State happens to have quite a sizable duck industry.

Mr. THYE. From the standpoint of a producer who is engaged in the production of poultry—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have his amendment modified by the addition of the word "ducks"?

Mr. THYE. I have no objection, Mr. President, to the modification of my amendment so as to include the word "ducks." I modify it accordingly, with pleasure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Anderson bill, which we are now considering, contains the following language on page 18 in section 408:

SEC. 408. For the purposes of this act—

(a) A commodity shall be considered storable upon determination by the Secretary that, in normal trade practice, it is stored for substantial periods of time and that it can be stored under the price-support program without excessive loss through deterioration or spoilage or without excessive cost for storage for such periods as will permit its disposition without substantial impairment of the effectiveness of the price-support program.

In my humble opinion that language is not sufficiently clear. It is not specific and mandatory. I am not certain whether the Secretary would give price support to poultry, eggs, pork, and turkeys, as well as beef. It is for that reason that I and my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have submitted the two amendments. My colleague's amendment is somewhat different from mine, but its purpose is the same, that is, a price support on the products I have mentioned. My amendment provides for price support from 75 percent to 90 percent. I cannot speak for my colleague's

amendment, but I have a nod from him indicating that his amendment likewise carries a price support of from 75 to 90 percent.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that we are all concerned with conserving the fertile topsoil of our land, and in view of the fact that the dairy type of farm enterprise will conserve the soil, and is soil building, and that such an enterprise lends itself to a family type of farm unit, it is on such a farm the boy and the girl can assist with the chores in the morning and in the evening during the school year, and out of school in the summertime they can assist in the harvest fields and in the hay fields and in the preparation of feed necessary to carry the livestock through the winter months, it is important that everything possible be done to encourage such farming. Such a farm operation is a complete farm operation which lends itself to the development of a family type farm. For that reason we must protect it.

In the years past, while we have had a soil-conservation program, we have always given consideration to appropriations to make possible the carrying out of soil-conservation practices. But here we are considering a family type farm support program which lends itself to soil-building practices. For that reason we must protect the dairy, the poultry, the egg, the livestock type of farm management.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that in the years past, while cotton, tobacco, wheat, and rice were classified as basic, they were not so basic in our Minnesota farm economy as the nonbasic commodities which we find listed, as pork, beef, poultry, eggs, dairy products, as well as turkeys. It is for that reason that, in my humble opinion, the amendment before the Senate which will give price support to poultry, eggs, turkeys, pork, and beef, is absolutely sound and reasonable. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator's amendment has not been sent to the desk. Does the Senator have a copy of his amendment?

Mr. THYE. The amendment was read into the RECORD last week. It must be on the desk, because I offered the amendment to the bill last week. If my amendment is not at the desk, I call attention to page—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that when the Senate recommitted the bill and it was subsequently reported, it came to the Senate containing only the committee amendments.

Mr. THYE. Then, Mr. President, I offer an amendment calling for price support for beef, pork, poultry, eggs, and turkeys. I agreed, at the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], to include ducks in the amendment. All those products would have a price support, under my amendment, of from 75 to 90 percent. I know there is before the Senate a printed copy of the amendment submitted by my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota, which contains some such language as I have just set forth. I am perfectly willing to concur with the junior Senator from

Minnesota in his amendment if his amendment has embodied in it all the provisions my amendment calls for. I would say that the amendment should appear under what is designated as title II, section 201, and it should follow right along with the language found on page 11, in line 18 of the bill, which reads as follows:

Irish potatoes, milk, and butterfat as follows:

Following that particular language could be inserted the amendment I have proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is now glad to say that the clerk has located the amendment as it was offered last week, and the Chair will ask the clerk to read it.

Mr. THYE. I shall be glad to have the amendment stated as I proposed it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 8—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as I said, the amendment offered last week would appear in a different place in the bill than the amendment I have now proposed to follow right after dairy products in the bill. It can be located properly in the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 8, after the word "potatoes", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "hogs, eggs, turkeys, and other poultry."

On page 5, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a semicolon.

On page 5, between lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to insert:

(d) The price of hogs, eggs, turkeys, and other poultry, respectively, shall be supported through loans, purchases, or other operations at a level not in excess of 90 percent nor less than 75 percent of the parity price therefor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it will be found that I submitted such an amendment, and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 4 on page 13774. It is the same amendment, and it could go into the bill either as it was spelled out at that time or in an appropriate place in the bill, which would be following dairy products.

I know that from the standpoint of the entire agricultural economy of the United States, dairy products—and, of course, the bill specifically refers to dairy products—poultry, eggs, turkeys, ducks, pork, and beef are major factors. In the event we permit our agricultural economy so far as it affects these particular commodities to go unprotected by price support, if the prices of those commodities drop to ruinous low levels, the entire agricultural economy will be affected. It is for that reason that I join my colleague [Mr. HUMPHREY] in offering an amendment providing for such price supports. I certainly hope that the price supports which we have asked for will be approved.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Without committing myself to the support of the Senator's amendment, I suggest that it would also

have to appear in paragraph (c) of section 201, as well as in the initial paragraph of section 201.

Mr. THYE. I certainly agree with the able Senator from Vermont. I appreciate the fact that he has called this to our attention. As I stated, the amendment should appear in the bill in the appropriate place.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I did not catch the point in the bill where this amendment would apply. Would it be in the mandatory price bracket?

Mr. THYE. It comes under title II, under the following language:

The Secretary is authorized and directed to make available (without regard to the provisions of title III) price support to producers of wool, tung nuts, honey, Irish potatoes, milk, and butterfat.

We would have to follow butterfat with the other products which I have mentioned, namely, beef, pork, poultry, eggs, turkeys—and, if the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is successful in his amendment, ducks.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment by adding oats, barley, rye, and flax?

Mr. THYE. I share the feeling of the junior Senator from North Dakota that a man who is producing barley, oats, or flax has just as much right to be recognized and given price support as the man who produces rice, peanuts, cotton, tobacco, or any other commodity. In the Northwest wheat is not a major in the agricultural economy. Corn is not a major in our agricultural economy in Minnesota. Livestock products are the major, so far as our agricultural economy is concerned. Therefore I could not and would not object to the Senator's proposal that barley, oats, and flax be included in the support from 75 to 90 percent. I know that the view was expressed in all the discussions in the committee that the Secretary should support barley, oats, and flax along with meats and dairy products.

Mr. YOUNG. Would the Senator include rye?

Mr. THYE. There are areas in the United States where the rye crop is the only safe crop that can be planted. The man who finds himself in such an area certainly must be protected. I think it is the intent of all those who support agricultural programs that all the commodities which figure in the basic part of our agricultural program should be spelled out and supported. It does us no good in the Midwest to put wheat and corn under seal and thereby deny the dairy farmer the feed, at the same time permitting dairy products to go to ruinous low levels, or permitting poultry prices or turkey prices to go to ruinous levels. Our whole philosophy should be to increase our animal husbandry and thereby bring about farm practices which will conserve the fertility of the soil and build the soil, rather than the philosophy of putting a commodity into a bin and sealing it up, and then worrying about what we are going to do to dispose of it.

Mr. YOUNG. Do I correctly understand that the Senator accepts the modification of oats, barley, rye and flax?

Mr. THYE. I shall be glad to do so, with the concurrence of my colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Minnesota modified his amendment by the insertion of the four additional commodities suggested by the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. THYE. With the concurrence of my colleague, I so modify the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, joining with my colleague the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] in the consideration of this amendment, I wish to reiterate and reemphasize what he has so well expressed as his belief and my belief as to the philosophy behind the pending legislation.

As I gather it, the economic philosophy in support of the pending legislation is that, despite the fact that some commodities are not spelled out by name, there is the intent to have such commodities supported by the discretionary authority of the Secretary at such price levels as to make them economically profitable. There is line after line within the pending bill which tells the people of America that it is the intention of the Congress and of the administrative branch of the Government to provide a price-support floor for the agricultural economy. The so-called basic commodities do not cover all the basic commodities of our agricultural economy. As pointed out in debate the other day on the floor of the Senate, some of the so-called basic commodities do not rank among the top 10 commodities in their relationship to the total agricultural income. Therefore, since the philosophy of the bill is to place a minimum floor under the agricultural economy, certain other products ought to be included in the mandatory list.

I think it is quite clear that I did not concur in the program of flexible supports. However, this is to be the philosophy of the bill. We voted down the 90-percent support; and since we voted down the 90-percent support, it appears even more evident to me that these other products, which are related types of agricultural commodities, should be supported at the same percentage levels as the so-called basics.

Many a turkey producer must buy feed. If that feed is supported at 75 to 90 percent, and the commodity which he is producing—turkeys, chickens, or ducks—is not supported at 75 to 90 percent, he will find himself on the diminishing end of an agricultural economic picture. It makes good practical common sense that there should be the same proportionate relationship between the commodities which the farmer has to buy and the commodities which the farmer has to sell.

Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point some pertinent factual material with reference to the production of hogs, turkeys, eggs, and chickens in the year 1948. With due State pride on behalf of the State of

Minnesota—I know my colleague concurs in this—we would like to make proper note as to where Minnesota ranks in the production of these important agricultural commodities. I ask unanimous consent that the information to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1948 marketing production

Hogs:	Pounds
United States total.....	15,524,000,000
Iowa	3,750,000,000
Illinois	1,940,000,000
Indiana	1,415,000,000
Minnesota	1,142,000,000
Missouri	1,093,000,000
Turkeys:	
United States total.....	579,000,000
California	97,000,000
Minnesota	52,000,000
Texas	48,000,000
Iowa	37,000,000
Oregon	32,000,000
Missouri	24,000,000
Eggs:	Dozen
United States total.....	55,168,000,000
Iowa	4,339,000,000
Minnesota	3,885,000,000
Pennsylvania	3,096,000,000
Texas	2,774,000,000
Missouri	2,731,000,000
Illinois	2,712,000,000
Chickens:	Pounds
United States total.....	2,354,000,000
Iowa	170,000,000
Pennsylvania	137,000,000
Illinois	121,000,000
Missouri	118,000,000
Minnesota	116,000,000
Indiana	111,000,000

1946 and 1947, Minnesota was second.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] that grain products such as barley, rye, oats, and flax, are a part of the general picture of a farm which exemplifies what we call diversified production. From what little I know about it—and I do not pose as an expert—for many years the Department of Agriculture has been educating the farmers at least in the Midwest, to what we call diversified farming. The American Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, the National Farmers Union, and every other great agricultural organization has been telling the farmers that they ought not to be one-crop farmers. They have been urged to diversify, to raise chickens, turkeys, if possible, a few cows, a few hogs, and a certain amount of feed grain, in addition to the cash crop. That has been the picture which has been developed in the agricultural belt of the Midwest. This type of agricultural development has saved the Government of the United States a great deal of money. As my colleague has stated, that kind of agricultural development has protected the soil. At the same time it has given a diversified agricultural economy a chance to survive, in order that there may be a cash crop for the farmer as well as the crops which he needs for feed. I think our amendment will do more to stabilize American agriculture than will be done by any other amendment which has been proposed to

this bill on the floor of the Senate. This amendment will tend to lead toward the family-size farm. It is the kind of amendment which will give a reasonable amount of stability and security.

Mr. President, let me say that I should like to have a greater amount of parity provided for these commodities. I still do not think 75 percent of parity is sufficient. I wish the amendment provided for 90 percent of parity, because 90 percent of parity is not too high. But I recognize the facts of the situation before us. In view of the fact that we have made up our mind that the so-called basics will be supported at from 75 percent to 90 percent of parity, so far as the Senate version of the bill is concerned, I see no reason why we should not spell out the other commodities to be supported, and thereby save the Secretary of Agriculture the problem of deciding whether it was the intent of Congress that they be supported. I do not wish to leave in the Secretary of Agriculture the amount of authority that is provided by the bill, without spelling out what the nonbasics to be supported will be, because according to my memory the nonbasics will be supported only if there is sufficient appropriation to provide for supporting them. However, if we definitely include them in the bill, with a provision of mandatory authority for mandatory price supports for them, then it will be the obligation of the Congress to provide appropriations to support them. Certainly I do not think the turkey farmer, the duck producer, the farmer who raises oats or barley or rye or flax, or the pork producer or the producer of eggs should be left with uncertainty as to whether the commodity he produces will be given supports. These commodities should be supported and no doubt should be permitted.

I point with reasonable pride to the leadership the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Thye] has given in this respect, and I join him in sponsoring the amendment. I urge favorable action and ask that the Senate conferees seek to incorporate our amendment in the final agricultural bill accepted by House and Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, of course, this amendment is what many persons thought would result from much of the discussion we had the other day. I do not regret that this matter has come out here in the form of a specific amendment.

I wish to say in the beginning that the term "basics" is a bad term. There are many persons who recognize that the commodities listed as "basics" are not truly basics. But once having started with that terminology, as the list of agricultural products was increased, the term "basics" continued to be applied to the commodities which it was desired to have subject to controls. If Senators will cross out that term, and will use the term "controllable products," that will be an improvement, because they are the products whose prices we have for a long time been supporting.

However, we shall have a great deal of difficulty if we embark upon a program

of supporting the prices of beef, hogs, poultry, eggs, turkeys, barley, oats, flax, and rye. I do not know why hogs was omitted. I am much more interested in hogs than I am in flax. [Laughter.]

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I submit that all we have to do is call upon groups of cattlemen or various cattlemen's associations in the various States and ask them whether they want price supports provided for beef. As a matter of fact, they have fought price supports harder than has any other single group in the United States, so far as I know. There has never been a time when the cattle raisers' associations have not had their representatives appear before the committees of Congress and say, "We do not want a support price on beef." They have refused it round after round after round.

I say to the Senate that I would be unwilling to attempt to shove down the throat of the American cattlemen the suggestion of a support price of 75 percent of parity for beef.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In line with what the distinguished Senator has said, I call the attention of the Senate to a meeting held before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the war, when beef was under control by the Office of Price Administration. Cattlemen from all over the country came before the committee and demanded that the Office of Price Administration remove controls from that one commodity, and that one alone. So if they did not want beef to be controlled during wartime, certainly they would not be very anxious to have it controlled now.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, they would not. No doubt the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] can remember that the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Association, with Judge Montague as its spokesman, has time after time appeared before congressional groups and has protested.

I was trying to think of a very distinguished gentleman from the home State of the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], a former member of the agricultural committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. Chris Abbott.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; Chris Abbott, from Hyannis, Nebr. All we have to do is call in such men, and they will tell us what the cattle industry thinks about supports for beef.

So I do not think it is a good idea to start talking about price supports for beef, when the cattlemen wish to have beef left outside of price supports.

As to the question of supports for pork, there may be some persons who are interested in having supports provided for pork. We had hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I believe it will be recalled that, for round after round, the representatives of the largest pork producers in the State of Iowa, and certainly those representing production in the entire

United States, announced that they did not want to have supports placed upon pork.

The question of supports for eggs certainly has been discussed considerably during the past few months. The distinguished Senator from Nevada said a moment ago that I had talked about dried eggs. I had; the Senator quoted me entirely correctly. But I was quoting from a telegram which was sent by a large importer, who said:

We offer you 46,000 pounds Chinese yolk for September-October delivery, \$1.25 a pound, ex-dock New York. Chinese dried whole eggs, \$1.10 a pound, New York. There is one car American dried whole eggs that would cost us \$1.35 f. o. b. western Nebraska.

Mr. President, what was the trouble with the American egg industry? We bought approximately 74,000,000 pounds of dried egg powder, but we had no place to store it. Why did we do that? Because we were committed, a year ago, to a program of supporting eggs at 90 percent of parity; and the Department of Agriculture, not having storage facilities for all the eggs which were being offered to them, had to run those eggs through the dryers, and to store tremendous quantities of dried eggs.

I do not believe Senators will help the agricultural program if they provide that 60 million or 70 million pounds of dried eggs shall be placed in cold storage at \$1.27 a pound, for if that is done, the opportunity for legitimate American industries to acquire their supplies of eggs in the normal fashion will be destroyed.

Let me illustrate that point by referring to the noodle industry. I never thought the noodle industry was a very large business; but when we remember the size of the soup business, we realize that it employs a great many persons. The firms in that business universally go to the western areas and buy broken eggs at a certain price per dozen. However, they were not able to do so during the past few years, because the Government was buying the eggs away from them. The people in that industry have been hard put to find a place to get their supplies.

The reason I had possession of those telegrams was that the noodle manufacturers with whom I had had dealings in some prior years, came to me and pleaded that I try to break loose some of the stock of dried eggs which the United States Government has on hand, in order that they might get their normal supplies of that product.

I do not wish to detain the Senate; but in view of the circumstances I have narrated I hope the Senate will not vote for the amendment relating to eggs.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Question arose as to whether the Senator would agree to have ducks included under the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I raised this question because of the fact that the term "poultry" appears in the bill itself. If the term "poultry" is proposed to include ducks, then there would seem to

be no need to have the term "ducks" included in the amendment or anywhere else in the bill.

I should like to inquire of the able Senator from New Mexico whether he considers the term "poultry" to embrace ducks.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I say to the distinguished Senator from New York that I do consider the term "poultry" to include ducks, and also includes geese, pigeons, and pheasants. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Minnesota upon including pheasants, because they are very popular in the State which is a neighbor of his State, and also in his State.

I think it would be much better to include chickens only or turkeys only, but I am well satisfied to have the term "poultry" include all poultry. The difficulty is exemplified by the inclusion of chickens and of eggs.

Mr. President, the reason we have been able to include other agricultural commodities is that we say they are controllable. We can say quite easily how much tobacco a man shall plant or how much rice a farmer shall plant or how much cotton a farmer shall plant. But, somehow, when we try to tell the chickens how many eggs they will be permitted to lay, they very frequently misunderstand the instructions. [Laughter.] We have all sorts of trouble with poultry as a result of that.

I do not wish to detain the Senate longer at this late hour. I merely assure Senators I think it is an amendment we can afford to vote down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] on behalf of himself and his colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether there remain any other amendments to the bill to be offered?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I intend to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has an amendment. Are there other amendments?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I was just informed the majority leader had inquired whether there were any additional amendments. I may say I was asked whether I would call the Senate's attention to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], relative to section 412 of the act. The amendment is on the table, and I ask to have it stated, in order that the amendment may be taken up at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. My only reason for making the inquiry was to determine whether we might expect to finish the bill to-

night. It is my understanding that the Senator from Montana desires to speak upon a subject entirely different from the farm bill. May I inquire how long our able friend will speak?

Mr. MURRAY. I shall endeavor to take not longer than 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], in explanation of the amendment, may appear in the RECORD immediately following the stating of the amendment, so that the Senate may have the information respecting the Senator's views on it.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement appears in the RECORD following the reading of the amendment.)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that the majority leader is attempting to ascertain how many more amendments are yet to be offered, in order to be able to estimate the length of the session. I may say to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has one amendment at least, possibly two. The Senator from Ohio has an amendment. I am wondering whether the Senator from Oklahoma has an amendment he intends to offer.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that will give the majority leader an idea of the number of amendments yet to be offered.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope we may finish the bill tonight. If the distinguished Senator from Montana takes but 20 or 25 minutes, it is possible we could finish by 7 o'clock. If possible, I should like to do that, but if not, we shall recess until noon tomorrow, since I have told everyone there would not be a night session.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, is it the announcement that the Senate will continue in session until 7, and if consideration of the bill is not concluded by that time, we shall recess until noon tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. May we have action on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] at this particular time? A number of Senators are present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield for that purpose?

Mr. MURRAY. I yielded for the purpose of having the amendment stated.

Mr. THYE. I thank the senior Senator from Montana for so courteously yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 412 relating to an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of sales operations, and insert as section 412 the following:

In the disposal of commodities, acquired through loans, purchases, and otherwise, the Secretary of Agriculture shall employ usual and customary channels of trade.

EXPLANATION BY SENATOR BUTLER OF AMENDMENT TO THE FARM BILL, H. R. 5345

The Butler amendment, proposed October 7, provides two principal things:

It would knock out section 412 of the Anderson bill providing for a new Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of sales operations.

It would require the Commodity Credit Corporation to employ usual and customary channels of trade in disposing of agricultural surpluses it has acquired.

This amendment is essential to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from invading still further the field of private and cooperative enterprise in the marketing of agricultural surpluses. During recent years, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been entering bit by bit into some of the fields that have always heretofore been properly handled by private marketing agencies. Both the cooperatives and private businesses have been becoming more and more alarmed at this steady invasion of their fields. They feel that if the trend is continued, ultimately the whole marketing function will be taken over by the Government and become nationalized.

The provision contained in section 412 of this bill for a new Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of sales appears to be a further step in that direction. The language of section 412 is drawn in rather general terms. While it does not specifically grant very much new authority to the Department of Agriculture, it will probably be interpreted as a general license to the Department to continue to take over more and more of these marketing functions. It seems essential to write into the bill clear-cut language so as to make the intent of Congress very definite.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the insertion made by Senator BUTLER in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 4, beginning on page 13792. These insertions show that the cooperatives particularly are very much concerned about this situation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have had a great many inquiries concerning this particular subject.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I understood I had yielded only for the purpose of having the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood the Senator from Montana.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There has been much discussion of this amendment. I should like to take time to discuss it, and I am sure there are other Senators who would like to discuss it. But I am willing to submit it now, to a division vote, and, whatever happens, take it to conference.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield, so we may have a division vote, if no one asks for the yeas and nays?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I would defer any further discussion of the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Montana has yielded so a vote may be taken on the amendment in line with the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, some of us would like to hear something more about the amendment before we vote on it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is a good idea.

Mr. DONNELL. What is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the pending question that of agreeing to the amendment called up by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator from Montana has the floor. I appreciate the effort which is being made to expedite consideration of the amendment, but I submit the orderly thing to do is to permit the Senator from Montana to speak, and to take up the amendment immediately after the Senator concludes, when the amendment becomes the pending question, so all Senators may understand what the amendment is.

Mr. ANDERSON. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from New Mexico is withdrawn. The Senator from Montana may proceed.

NOMINATION OF LELAND OLDS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I expect to be absent from the Senate for the next few days, I should like to call the attention of Senators to a matter of grave public interest and concern.

Mr. President, a legal execution has been arranged to take place in this Chamber in a few days when the President's appointment of Leland Olds to a third term on the Federal Power Commission is to come before us for confirmation or rejection. It is being said in the lobbies, in the press, and on the air waves that the vote against confirmation is virtually a sure thing. This I refuse to believe. Leland Olds' official life is not going to be ended now.

It is to enlist other Members of the Senate and the American people in an examination of the vast interests at stake in the life or death of Leland Olds as a Federal Power Commissioner, in advance of the opening of debate and while there is yet time for examination of the facts and evidence, that I take the floor at this time.

Leland Olds, the man and the public official, has been pushed around, slandered, and vilified long enough. It is time

for those of us who know that he is not a Communist, that he is not an enemy of private enterprise, that he is not a traitor, or any other of the cheap and disgraceful things that were thrown at him in hearings, to fight back; it is time to point out that he is an intelligent, far-seeing, statesmanlike, courageous, and incorruptible public servant, that he is loyal, deeply religious in his own faith, and that he deserves well of the Republic which he has served with devotion, international distinction, and success for the past 10 years.

I do not propose to engage the Senate in debate at this time on the merits and demerits of the Olds reappointment to a third term. I am resolved to lay before the Senate and the American people some food for thought, for searching of conscience, and for closer examination of every man's and woman's individual and common interest in the Olds re-nomination.

Mr. President, this fight which at the moment is centered on the reappointment or rejection of Leland Olds is only beginning. The basic issue will not be settled until it is settled and settled right, that is, in the people's interest. Nor will Leland Olds be counted out as a leader and symbol in this fight. I believe, whatever the polls today may be, that, when the Senate and the American people fully appreciate the issue and the magnitude and importance of the stake, our historic policy will be reaffirmed and Leland Olds will be put back to work as a member of the Federal Power Commission.

What is the issue?

President Truman, in his October 3, 1949, letter to the senior Senator from Colorado, has stated it well. He said:

We cannot allow great corporations to dominate the commissions which have been created to regulate them.

In other words, who runs this country? The people, through their constitutionally elected and appointed representatives and officials, or monopolistic corporations which, when unable to get their way by legislation and through the courts, seek to achieve it by terrorization of the officials charged with the duty of administering laws enacted and interpreted in conformity with our Constitution?

Today I do not want to take the time of the Senate to discuss all the pros and cons of the confirmation of the nomination of Leland Olds. I do think it proper, and very much in the public interest, and in the national interest in terms of the commerce, welfare, and national security clauses of the Constitution, to lay before the Members of the Senate and the American people some indication, some inkling, of the size and scope, and the vital interest of every American in the debate on the Olds appointment which, I understand, is scheduled shortly to ensue.

Such an exposition would be in order even if for any reason Mr. Olds' appointment were not to come before us before adjournment. This is so, be-

cause, Mr. President, we are embarked upon a great debate, a debate over who shall run this country, the people or massed and closely allied concentrations of economic power beyond anything in the history of man. We recently won one stage in that debate when we restored to the Interior Department appropriation bill the many items for the development and transmission of public power for the benefit of domestic consumers, industry, and business that had been cut out or made meaningless following requests by representatives of the private power interests. As we won that fight, so we shall win this fight. The American people, and their Congress, will not surrender their country and their Government to the corporations.

I dare say, Mr. President, that I shall be disclosing no secret when I say that what we are all concerned about in acting upon the President's appointment of Leland Olds is the long-range effect of our action upon Government regulation of private utilities and the immediate effect upon the price of natural gas.

Both the proponents and the opponents of Mr. Olds have these matters in mind. Mr. Olds' opponents want higher prices. They are on record for increases in field prices of natural gas. They are for charging what the traffic will bear. Mr. Olds is not. His proponents are not.

I am sure there is no Member of the Senate who for a moment entertains the notion that when his confirmation comes before the Senate we shall be voting upon Mr. Olds' writings for the labor press more than 20 years ago. I am sure, Mr. President, that what Mr. Olds wrote about his ideas of the state of the Nation in the 1920's is as of little concern to the Senators of 1949 as are the ill-fated prophecies of Andrew Mellon and of President Hoover in those same years. The Senate will recall the prophecies of the 1920's, so soon to be discredited by events, that we had arrived at a condition of permanent prosperity and that poverty had been abolished forever from the United States.

Those were the days, Mr. President, when some men talked of two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage, world without end. Those were the days when encyclopedias included a learned treatise by the late Henry Ford proving that mass production had abolished the old-fashioned business cycle of boom and bust, and a definitive description of the new corporate state, written and signed by its inventor, one Benito Mussolini.

Ford's piece was in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1932.

Mussolini's piece was in *Encyclopedia Italiana*, 1932.

Wise men learn from experience. In the light of the wisdom of later years they do not debate among themselves as to the wisdom or folly of their words of 20 and 30 years ago. And this is especially true, I venture to say, of men who hold political office, for politicians of necessity are all wise men, or presumed to be so by a voting plurality of their constituents.

Mr. Olds has not repudiated what he wrote a quarter of a century ago, insofar as its purpose was at that time to inform and shock American workers into an awareness of what was happening to them and to the country; he has stated that his attitudes and beliefs have developed and changed. For 20 years Leland Olds has been engaged in the effort to make private enterprise adapt itself for survival by meeting the needs of the American people.

I shall not consume the Senate's time by discussing what we are not truly concerned with in the Olds reappointment. I am here to lay before the Senate a few preliminary facts relating to the immediate issue that is involved in the confirmation of the nomination of Leland Olds. I do so in order that the Senators and the American people will have time to examine, test, and consider these facts before we are called upon to vote.

The immediate issue that will be before us in the Olds confirmation, Mr. President, is the price of natural gas.

The oil and gas companies seek, by the removal of Leland Olds from the Federal Power Commission, to prevent Federal regulation of their sales of gas to interstate pipe lines. The evidence proves beyond a shadow of doubt that this is the purpose of the oil and gas companies and that this is the reason for the objections that have been raised to Mr. Olds' confirmation. Today I wish only to get before the Senate an ample description of the stakes for which these industries are playing.

The stakes in this case are of staggering proportions. Ten billion dollars is a conservative estimate of what the oil and gas companies hope to extract from the public when they get Olds out of the way. The dollar rewards that are involved dwarf the sums for which certain oil companies gambled when they tried by corruption of public officials to acquire drilling rights on Teapot Dome. Teapot Dome, as its name might suggest, would seem to be only a tempest in a teapot when we try it for size against the \$10,000,000,000 which the oil industry hopes to extract from household and industrial consumers of natural gas by wrecking Federal regulation of the price of gas.

In the Report of the Special Investigating Committee to the Seventieth Congress, first session, May 28, 1928, pursuant to Senate Resolution 101, it is stated at page 4 as follows:

Secretary Wilbur has estimated the net value of the leased reserves at \$1,000,000,000.

The Secretary of the Interior was speaking of what was involved in the attempted rape of Teapot Dome and Elk Hills.

Let me assure the Senate I am not here implying any parallel between what was then attempted and what is now before us. On the contrary, I am emphasizing the difference, and that difference, if stated in money terms, is the difference between one and ten billion dollars.

It is because I consider \$10,000,000,000 a not inconsiderable sum to be voted

out of the pockets of natural gas consumers and into the treasuries of oil and gas companies that I have intruded upon the time of the Senate to place these preliminary facts before my colleagues, and, if the press and radio will permit, the American people.

Let me make clear, Mr. President, how the oil industry will amass this added fortune if, by defeating the Olds nomination, it should succeed in defeating public regulation of its sales of natural gas into interstate commerce.

Natural gas is a very fine fuel. At the relatively low prices for which it can be profitably, and indeed very profitably, sold by the oil companies, it competes favorably with coal and fuel oil. Therefore it is in great demand. Pipe-line companies are hard-pressed to meet the requirements of their customers. The oil companies which own the gas in the ground enjoy a luxurious sellers' market. Under these circumstances it should be plain to everyone that only Government control of the prices at which the gas can be sold to the pipe lines will hold the price down to within some reasonable relationship to cost and a fair profit. With Olds on the Federal Power Commission, this will be done; without him, it may not be done. The present balance in the Commission is 2 to 2.

How far the price of natural gas would rise if action of the Senate were to support the view that these sales should not be regulated by the Federal Power Commission is, of course, a matter of some conjecture. Yet we find a very satisfactory clue on that point in the claims which the oil and gas companies have made many times in public hearings and which they continue to make. They say that their gas should sell at its intrinsic value and what they mean by "intrinsic value" is a price for gas which places it, on a B. t. u. or heating-unit basis, on the same high levels as coal or oil. When they say they want to be free to sell their gas at its intrinsic value, what they really mean is that they want to charge for it all that the traffic will bear. Pages of testimony by qualified spokesmen for the industry make this plain. I refer to page 143, *Natural Gas Investigation*, Docket No. G-580, Report of Commissioners Leland Olds and Claude L. Draper, 1948.

The prices which oil companies are now getting for their gas in their sales to the pipe lines average about 4½ cents per thousand cubic feet. The average price could increase by at least 10 cents a thousand if it were to be sold for all the traffic would bear.

However, to be extremely conservative in estimating the total sums involved, we can assume that the increase in average price would fall somewhere between 5 cents and 10 cents per thousand cubic feet. I make this lower estimate of what price increase will be possible, if and when all thought of Federal control has been banished from the future of these oil and gas companies, because I wish to give recognition to the fact that a considerable part of the gas in the ground is already contracted for by the pipe

lines. True, these contracts are mostly of the flexible variety, with the flexibility all in the upward direction. But I am sure we will fully allow for any lag which existing contracts may impose on the upward price movement if we estimate that the increase will be within a range of from 5 cents to 10 cents per thousand cubic feet, instead of the increase of 10 cents or more which would result if the price of all gas could be increased to the limit of what the traffic will bear.

Known reserves of natural gas in the ground, according to Gas Facts, American Gas Association, 1948, page 17, amounted to 174,000,000,000 cubic feet at the end of last year. Let me repeat that these are present known reserves. No gas or oil man would say that additional supplies will not be discovered. In fact, the known reserves increased by 8,000,000,000 cubic feet during 1948, although the country drained off 6,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas in that year.

To get an idea of how much is at stake in the industry's desire to sell this gas uninhibited by Government regulation, we can multiply these known reserves of 174,000,000,000 cubic feet by 5 cents per thousand and by 10 cents per thousand. The resulting figure for the total amount involved ranges from \$8,500,000,000 to \$17,000,000,000. Therefore when I place a figure of only \$10,000,000,000 on the question which is shortly to come before the Senate I am not assuming that the price of gas will rise to the limit of what the traffic will bear. Moreover I am making ample allowance for the fact that not all of these reserves will be sold into interstate commerce subject to Federal regulation.

So the first point which I want to place clearly before the Senate in this summary of the facts in this overriding and, to me, overwhelming, fact that the total sum at stake in the confirmation of Leland Olds may be conservatively placed at \$10,000,000,000.

I am sure the Members of the Senate and the American people will be interested in the geographic distribution of this sum, both as to its source and as to its destination.

First, let me explain where these gas reserves, which are intended to be so greatly appreciated in dollar value, are held.

Thereafter I shall give the Senate as good a basis as I can find for estimating how much of this increased cost of natural gas will be contributed by the several States.

I am sure I have made clear that this \$10,000,000,000 windfall, while it may be attributed to action that may be taken by the Senate, is not in the nature of a Government subsidy to the oil and gas industry. Rather it will be an enforced contribution by the householders and the industries which burn the gas to the companies which own the gas in the ground. It will be levied by an industry which, unable to persuade the Federal Government to amend the Natural Gas Act, has succeeded in its vendetta against Leland Olds, who is committed to carrying out that policy of effective regulation as set

by the Congress and interpreted by the courts under our Constitution.

Total reserves of natural gas at the end of 1948 were, as I have stated, 174,000,000,000 cubic feet.

Of this total, 55 percent or nearly 96,000,000,000 cubic feet were in Texas. Next in line was Louisiana, with 14 percent of the total, or 24,000,000,000 cubic feet.

Kansas, Oklahoma, California, and New Mexico follow next in order with amounts ranging from 8 percent down to 3 percent of the Nation's gas reserves. These four States together account for 41,000,000,000 feet, or 24 percent of the present reserves.

Texas, it will be noted, owns the lion's share of these reserves. Texas, it may also be noted, contributed the lion's share of the witnesses and messages opposing the confirmation of Leland Olds, as printed in the subcommittee's hearings. Perhaps, Mr. President, it is but a coincidence—a mathematical accident—but I cannot withhold from my colleagues of the Senate the curious fact that, whereas Texas owns 55 percent of the Nation's natural gas reserves, 20 out of 37, or exactly 54 percent, of the persons recorded in opposition to the Olds appointment came from the State of Texas. All the witnesses who testified against Leland Olds were associated with the oil and gas industry, with colleges in oil-producing States, or with public office in oil-producing States.

What part of this \$10,000,000,000 bonanza will be contributed by the various States in which natural gas is consumed cannot be estimated very accurately at this time. For there has been, and there will be, a rapid expansion of pipe-line capacity to carry this fuel from the producing areas into the great industrial area of the Northeast. It is still true that the greater part of natural gas is consumed in the States where it is produced, but if the Senate creates, as the industry hopes it will, a situation in which it can look forward to an unregulated future, we may expect that much greater volumes of gas will be sold in the great industrial triangle delimited by lines connecting Boston, Milwaukee, and Birmingham.

On the basis of the 1948 distribution of natural gas, the five East North Central States—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin—consumed 15 percent of the national total. The proportion of the total supply which these States will consume in future years can be expected to be considerably greater than this. Yet on the 1948 basis alone, the contribution which those States must make to the \$10,000,000,000 increase in the value of present gas reserves would be \$1,500,000,000.

The three Middle Atlantic States—New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania—are just at the beginning of their natural-gas use, yet they used 7 percent of the national total in 1948.

The seven West North Central States—Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota—have experienced only a limited industrial development, but they

consumed 12½ percent of our natural gas last year.

Adding these two groups of States to the East North Central area, we find that these 14 States along the northern and eastern borders of the country accounted for 35 percent of total natural-gas consumption in 1948. On this basis they are already earmarked to contribute \$3,500,000,000 to the prospective \$10,000,000,000 take, but with increased interstate movement of gas they can look forward to a considerably larger contribution—well over \$4,000,000,000 and perhaps close to \$5,000,000,000.

The six Mountain States—Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico—will be called on to contribute 6½ percent of the \$10,000,000,000 total, or \$650,000,000, at their 1948 rate of natural gas consumption. Gas consumers in the State of Montana would contribute \$100,000,000 of this.

Increase in the cost of natural gas to consumers, if the industry is to be turned loose to charge all the traffic will bear, was recently estimated by the Federal Power Commission at \$500,000,000 a year. This estimate is contained in the Commission's report to the Senate dated May 16, 1949, on S. 1498. This estimate includes only the gas that is sold by utility companies.

Sales of industrial gas in the Southwestern States, where most of the gas is produced, would add very greatly to the total annual take of the oil and gas companies, if they could sell it for all the traffic will bear, that is, at the equivalent of the cost of the fuel oil. Commissioner Olds, in his testimony on S. 1498, before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on May 24, 1949, submitted a table of figures showing that sales of industrial gas in the seven Southwestern States of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas would have been increased by \$413,000,000 in 1947 if the oil and gas companies had been free to price gas on the basis which they claim is its intrinsic value. This would have been an increase of 400 percent over the actual cost of gas to industries of those seven States in that year.

Obviously, as Mr. Olds observed, such fantastic overpricing would make the industrial use of gas impracticable for the industries of those States. His calculation, however, is not based on any theory of pricing which Mr. Olds advances, but upon the theory of "intrinsic value" which the industry advocates, and upon figures relevant thereto which were submitted to the Senate committee during the 1948 hearings on the Moore-Rizley bill by Edward Falck, representing the Independent Natural Gas Association of America.

Now let me bring to the attention of the Senate the stake of some of the individual oil and gas companies in the elimination of Federal regulation over prices of gas moving in interstate commerce. I have said that we may expect natural-gas prices to increase between 5 cents and 10 cents per thousand cubic feet. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a table entitled

"Natural Gas Acreage in the Texas Panhandle and Hugoton Gas Fields Owned in Fee or Held Through Leasehold by Certain Companies, Together With Esti-

mated Reserves and Possible Values." This is taken from the testimony of Commissioner Olds on May 24, 1949, previously referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

TABLE A.—Natural-gas acreage in the Texas Panhandle and Hugoton gas fields owned in fee or held through leasehold by certain companies, together with estimated reserves and possible values

	Panhandle field (acres)	Hugoton field (acres)	Total (acres) ¹	Possible re- serves at 7,500 thousand cubic feet per acre (MMcf)	Value at 5 cents per thousand cubic feet	Value at 10 cents per thou- sand cubic feet
Pipe-line companies:						
Canadian River Gas Co.	262,883		262,883	1,971,000	\$98,500,000	\$197,100,000
Cities Service Gas Co.	104,921	201,601	306,522	2,299,000	114,950,000	229,900,000
Consolidated Gas Utilities Corp.	17,551		17,551	132,000	6,600,000	13,200,000
El Paso Natural Gas Co.		34,800	34,800	261,000	13,550,000	26,100,000
Kansas-Colorado Utilities Co.		6,693	6,693	50,000	2,500,000	5,000,000
Kansas-Nebraska Natural Gas Co.		8,080	8,080	61,000	3,050,000	6,100,000
Northern Natural Gas Co.	16,005	188,917	204,922	1,537,000	76,850,000	153,700,000
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.	40,269	401,301	441,570	3,312,000	165,600,000	331,200,000
Texoma Natural Gas Co.	140,118		140,118	1,050,000	52,500,000	105,000,000
Total for group	581,747	841,392	1,423,139	10,673,000	533,650,000	1,067,300,000
Other companies:						
Cabot Carbon Co.		17,920	17,920	134,000	6,700,000	13,400,000
Cities Service Oil Co.		33,900	33,900	254,000	12,700,000	25,400,000
Columbian Fuel Corp.		55,633	55,633	417,000	20,850,000	41,700,000
Fin-Ker Oil & Gas Production Co.		48,200	48,200	362,000	18,100,000	36,200,000
Hagy, Harrington & Marsh	32,900	149,848	182,838	1,371,000	68,550,000	137,100,000
Kansas Natural Gas Inc.		14,980	14,980	112,000	5,600,000	11,200,000
Magnolia Petroleum Co.		118,480	118,480	889,000	44,450,000	88,900,000
Peerless Oil & Gas Co.		116,000	116,000	870,000	43,500,000	87,000,000
Phillips Petroleum Co.	285,000	620,880	905,880	6,794,000	339,700,000	779,400,000
Republic Natural Gas Co.		220,501	220,501	1,654,000	82,700,000	165,400,000
Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp.	220,000	1,700	221,700	1,664,000	83,200,000	166,400,000
Simclair Prairie Oil Co.		19,000	19,000	142,000	7,100,000	14,200,000
Skelly Oil Co.		171,520	171,520	1,286,000	64,300,000	128,600,000
Stanolind Oil & Gas Co.		600,000	600,000	4,500,000	225,000,000	450,000,000
United Producing Co.		90,920	90,920	682,000	34,100,000	68,200,000
White Eagle Oil Co.		70,000	70,000	525,000	26,250,000	52,500,000
Total for group	537,990	2,349,482	2,887,472	21,656,000	1,082,800,000	2,165,600,000
Total acreage listed	1,119,737	3,190,874	4,310,611	32,320,000	1,616,450,000	3,232,900,000
Holdings by others	280,263	1,009,126	1,289,389	9,671,000	483,550,000	967,100,000
Total acreage of field	1,400,000	4,200,000	5,600,000	42,000,000	2,100,000,000	4,200,000,000
Percent of listed acreage to total	80	75	77			

¹ Data on acreage are from testimony in this record and from Commission files and records.

² Held by affiliates.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it should be noted that this table relates to the gas reserves in only two fields, which account for only forty-two trillion out of the total reserves of one hundred and seventy-four trillion cubic feet throughout the country.

Some of these companies stand to gain sizable increases, indeed, in the value of their present reserves. Phillips Petroleum stands to increase the value of its gas in these two fields by \$389,000,000 to \$779,000,000 on increases of 5 cents and 10 cents, respectively, in the price of natural gas.

Stanolind Oil & Gas, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of Indiana, stands to gain, on the same assumptions, from \$225,000,000 to \$450,000,000.

Pipe-line companies, which naturally expect to increase the value of their own gas reserves when they pay higher prices for gas to the independent producers, would also cash in for large amounts.

Panhandle Eastern's holdings in these fields would be increased more than \$165,000,000 in value through a 5-cent increase in price and would increase \$331,000,000 through a 10-cent increase.

Cities Service Gas Co. would stand to gain one hundred to two hundred million dollars, and so on.

Perhaps the significance of these prospective gains in value of gas reserves will be more readily appreciated by the Senate and the American people if re-

lated to the cost of the acreage which these companies hold. Acreage-cost figures are available for the Panhandle and Hugoton holdings of five pipe-line companies included in the table which I have submitted for the Record.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MURRAY. I am anxious to get through with the presentation of these statements, because we are interrupting the consideration of the farm bill. I am merely introducing these statements so as to make them available to the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for a question in reference to his statements?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for one question, yes.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator make a statement as to what would happen to the holdings of Panhandle Eastern?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware that Panhandle Eastern is a natural-gas company under the act, and that its holdings would not be affected one way or the other by the legislation to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. MURRAY. That is a matter for the Senator to discuss when the legislation he refers to is before the Senate in full debate.

Mr. KERR. I was wondering whether the Senator had knowledge with reference to the statements he is making.

Mr. MURRAY. My information is to the effect which I have stated. If I am mistaken I am willing to be corrected.

Mr. KERR. Then I will say for the Record, in response to the Senator's suggestion, that Panhandle Eastern is a natural-gas company under the act, and would not in anywise be affected by the legislation to which the Senator has referred, if it were enacted.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. It is a question which will be considered, I am sure, in the full-dress debate on the legislation he refers to when it comes before the Senate but it is not related to the question of the confirmation.

Mr. KERR. I remind the Senator that that is well known by the gentleman to whom he is referring.

Mr. MURRAY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KERR. I remind the Senator that that is a fact well known to the gentleman to whom the Senator is referring, if it is not known to the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. My information has been to the effect that the facts as I have stated them are correct. As I say, if there is any mistake in anything I have said, it is a matter to be brought before the Senate when the full debate comes before us. I am merely making this statement at this time because I expect to be absent attending the funeral of the late Senator Miller from Idaho, and very likely I shall not be present when this question comes before the Senate.

Perhaps the significance of these prospective gains in value of gas reserves will be more readily appreciated by the Senate and the American people if related to the cost of the acreage which these companies hold. Acreage cost figures are available for the Panhandle and Hugoton holdings of five pipe-line companies included in the table which I have submitted for the Record. These figures are taken from the Olds-Draper report in 1948 on the Natural Gas Investigation of the Federal Power Commission, at page 149.

Permit me to recite the facts for each of the five companies for they are truly astonishing.

Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. acquired its Panhandle and Hugoton acreage at a cost of \$1,913,433. A 5-cent increase in the price of gas above actual cost plus a 6½-percent return would yield an excess profit to this company of \$165,600,000 over the life of the reserves. Assuming these reserves to last 25 years, the annual excess profit would amount to \$6,600,000. This is a return of 344 percent per year on the original investment. If the price increase were 10 cents, the excess profit would be at a rate of 688 percent a year on original cost.

Canadian River Gas Co. acquired its acreage in these fields for \$2,035,640. A 5-cent increase in the price of gas above actual cost and a 6½-percent return would enable this company to earn an excess profit of \$3,900,000 a year throughout an assumed period of 25 years for the life of the reserves. This excess profit would equal 193 percent a year on original investment. At a 10-cent increase in price the excess profit would represent 386 percent a year on investment.

Cities Service Gas Co. acquired its holdings in these two fields at a cost of \$1,720,745. Its excess profit on a 5-cent increase in price over cost and a 6½-percent return would be \$4,600,000 a year or 266 percent on original investment for 25 years. At a 10-cent increase in prices its excess annual return would be 532 percent a year throughout the life of the reserves.

Northern Natural Gas Co. acquired its holdings in these fields at a cost of \$615,304. A 5-cent increase in the price of gas over cost and a 6½-percent return would give it excess profit of \$3,070,000 a year for 25 years. This is an annual return of 500 percent on original investment. If the increase in gas price is 10 cents, the excess profit would amount to 1,000 percent per year on investment.

Texoma Natural Gas Co. holds its gas acreage in the Panhandle-Hugoton area at \$8,186,406, a figure which apparently includes some \$5,000,000 of write-up over original cost. On a deflated investment base of \$3,186,406, a 5-cent gas-price increase could provide the company an excess profit of \$2,100,000 a year for 25 years, or 66 percent a year on original cost; while a 10-cent increase would provide an annual yield of 132 percent on original cost.

I dare say, Mr. President, if we knew the cost of gas acreage held by the oil

and gas companies, we would find the same fantastic profit possibilities as I have shown for these pipe-line companies.

Let me assure the Senate that these oil and gas companies which stand to gain the lion's share of the \$10,000,000,000 bonanza are neither small nor struggling enterprises. They are among the largest and most profitable corporations in the United States.

Testimony presented to the subcommittee in opposition to confirmation of Leland Olds, like testimony presented in earlier hearings in support of legislation to exempt from regulation sales of natural gas to pipe lines, bears heavily on the plight of the small producer and the small-royalty owner. Let me say that I know of no one who is not ready to exempt from the scope of regulation such sales by small producers. They must look to the great interstate pipe-line companies if they are to dispose of their gas in interstate commerce, and none of us will have any illusion as to who will have the controlling effect upon prices in such transactions between small sellers and giant buyers.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Do the residents of the Senator's State ship in interstate commerce any commodities produced in his State?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; they do.

Mr. KERR. Any natural resources?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator feel that the Federal Government should invade the field of production of the copper business and say that the producer thereof shall be limited to the cost of the reserve, plus 6 percent, merely by reason of the fact that it is shipped in interstate commerce?

Mr. MURRAY. I think that is an entirely different category. I do not think that is a legitimate comparison.

Mr. KERR. What difference is there between the producer of natural gas producing in a free market and the producer of copper producing in a free market?

Mr. MURRAY. Gas goes into consumption by citizens generally, whereas copper goes into consumption by industry on a large scale.

Mr. KERR. What is the difference between the citizens of consuming States, whether they are buying copper from the Senator's State or gas from my State?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator knows what the rule is with reference to public utilities.

Mr. KERR. By what authority does the Senator refer to the producer of natural gas as a utility?

Mr. MURRAY. When it is furnished to consumers, he becomes a utility.

Mr. KERR. Is the identity of utility imposed upon an individual by the whim of a public official or by an act of Congress?

Mr. MURRAY. It is not imposed upon him by the whim of anyone. It is im-

posed by act of Congress and decisions of the court.

Mr. KERR. Is there any reason why it should be imposed upon a producer of gas any more than upon a producer of copper?

Mr. MURRAY. As I say, they are in entirely different categories.

Mr. KERR. If each individual owns his production, does he not have the right to sell it wherever he can?

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, but there is only one place where gas can be sold, and that is to private consumers, people in small homes.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware of the fact that only 16 percent of the gas produced is sold in the market to which he refers?

Mr. MURRAY. That may be true at the present time, but we are thinking about the future. We are talking about what is going to happen.

Mr. KERR. Did not the Senator say that that was the only place where gas could be sold?

Mr. MURRAY. I am not going to engage in any long-winded debate with the Senator. These are points which will be discussed in great detail when the question comes before the Senate for debate.

Mr. KERR. I merely asked what difference there was between the status of an independent producer of gas on the one hand, having the right to sell his product in a free market, and the independent producer of copper on the other hand, who has the right to sell his product in a free market?

Mr. MURRAY. I think there is considerable difference, just as there is a difference with respect to water.

Mr. KERR. If a man owned water he would have the right to sell it in a free market, would he not?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, he would.

Mr. KERR. If he owns copper, he has the right to sell it in a free market.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. If he owns gas, does he not have the same American right to sell it in a free market?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, if it is confined to a free market, and not sold to the public.

Mr. KERR. Is there anything sold that is not sold to the public? Who else buys things, if the Senator can enlighten us?

Mr. MURRAY. I am discussing the theory of utilities, and public service. When a producer devotes his commodity to the public service he assumes a public responsibility imposed by the Congress through statute.

Mr. KERR. I have asked the Senator to explain what there is inherent in the status of an independent producer of gas, selling it in a free market, which automatically constitutes him a utility?

Mr. MURRAY. If he engages in dealing with the citizens of the country, and selling his commodity on a basis of that kind, if the commodity is something like gas or water, then he becomes a public utility.

Mr. KERR. By what authority does the Senator make that statement?

Mr. MURRAY. By the general laws of the country. It has been well established that if a man goes into the water business in a community and undertakes to sell water to the community he becomes a public utility.

Mr. KERR. The independent producer sells gas at the well.

Mr. MURRAY. If he wishes to hold his gas in the ground at the well, and keep it there, that is all right. But if he is going to sell gas to the American people and make millions of dollars out of it, he should come under Government control.

Mr. KERR. What is the difference between the seller of gas and the seller of coal?

Mr. MURRAY. That is a matter for the Senator to debate when the question comes up.

Mr. KERR. I merely ask the Senator to tell the Senate what would be the difference between the independent producer of gas selling his product in a free market and the independent producer of coal selling his product in a free market.

Mr. MURRAY. This is a subject which could be considered.

Mr. KERR. Is that a question which can be answered?

Mr. MURRAY. If coal became a commodity in such demand as water is, and of such an essential character, I suppose coal could be made subject to control, if that were desired.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Montana is aware of the fact that there are five times as many individual consumers of coal as there are of gas, is he not?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, but gas is in more demand; it is in a different situation at the present time. People want gas and want to get it at a fair price. They do not want the corporations which have gotten control of it to monopolize it and force them to pay excessive prices for it.

Mr. KERR. Who does the Senator think is entitled to help fix the fair price, if the producer who owns it is not?

Mr. MURRAY. I thought that myself at one time. Years ago I had the notion that if a man owned the water supply in a community, he could fix the price of it. But we very soon got over that notion when public service commissions were established and undertook to regulate prices of that sort.

Mr. KERR. I did not know we had a water bill under consideration. I thought the bill related to the producer of a natural commodity or natural resource which belongs to the man who finds it.

Mr. MURRAY. But gas is not produced; it is just taken out of the ground.

Mr. KERR. What is done in the case of copper or coal?

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, it is taken out of the ground. But gas is not produced; it is something that is in the ground.

Mr. KERR. And the Senator from Montana does not think it belongs to the man who finds it and takes it out of the ground; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. It belongs to him as long as he keeps it in the ground. But if he wants to sell it in interstate com-

merce, and sell it to the public, he has no right to expect to demand excessive prices for it.

Mr. KERR. He has the right to sell it for only what he can get for it; does he not?

Mr. MURRAY. For what he can get for it?

Mr. KERR. Does not he have the right to sell what he owns for what he can get for it?

Mr. MURRAY. I would not say that is always true.

Mr. KERR. Is not that what the coal producer sells coal for?

Mr. MURRAY. He sells it for what he can get for it.

Mr. KERR. Is not that what the copper producer sells his copper for?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Is not that what the zinc producer and the lead producer sell their commodities for?

Mr. MURRAY. Those commodities are under such competitive control that theoretically the public gets them at a fair price.

Mr. KERR. They are under such control of whom or by whom?

Mr. MURRAY. They are under, that is to say, a competitive situation where only a certain price can be obtained for them.

Mr. KERR. Is not gas in the same situation?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; under some circumstances.

Mr. KERR. Then why should someone in Washington tell the producer of gas that he must sell his product under a regulated market, whereas the Washington authorities do not say that to any other producer of any other commodity under the American flag?

Mr. MURRAY. Because it is in a different category.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator explain the difference in the category.

Mr. MURRAY. I have tried to explain it several times, but I do not think I can make it any plainer than I have already undertaken to make it.

Mr. KERR. I agree with the Senator that it cannot be made any plainer.

Mr. MURRAY. It will be discussed and considered on the floor of the Senate when the matter comes to the floor of the Senate. If anyone is being deprived of any rights, that is something to which we should give very careful consideration.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. If the utility status is to be applied to a group of people in the United States, should it be done by the Congress of the United States or by a commission created by the Congress, but not having specific authority to do so?

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, commissions are created by the Congress with certain authority and power.

Mr. KERR. I am talking about the OPA regulation of the price of a commodity in a free market. Who should put that restriction upon the producer of that commodity in this country?

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, Congress lays the basis for the control of those matters.

Mr. KERR. If it is done, it should be done by the Congress; should it not?

Mr. MURRAY. Of course.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Montana now point to the law which puts that restriction upon the producer of gas in this country?

Mr. MURRAY. It is there by the natural fact that it is gas and is going into the service of the people on that basis; and therefore it should be controlled.

Mr. KERR. Does it merely automatically apply without any law?

Mr. MURRAY. I think so; but Congress has recognized such control.

But, Mr. President, let me assure the Senate that the really small producer is of the same relative inconsequence in the ownership and production of gas as he is in most of our great industries. The Federal Power Commission's report to Congress on the Kerr bill, Senate bill 1498, dated May 16, 1949, disclosed great concentration of ownership. It showed that 86 percent of the Nation's gas reserves is controlled by the so-called independent producers, and that by 1952 more than two-thirds of this "independent" supply will come from only 35 of the 2,300 producers who make sales to interstate pipe lines.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MURRAY. I have already yielded freely to the Senator. It is now 25 minutes to 7.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator does not care to yield further, I shall not ask further questions.

Mr. MURRAY. I prefer not to yield. At the time when I took up this matter, I promised to take only 20 minutes. If the Senator from Oklahoma obtains unanimous consent from the Senate to have this debate continued, of course that will be all right with me.

By an exemption from Federal regulation of producers who sell not more than 2,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas in a year, we could exempt 2,230 of the 2,300 suppliers of gas to interstate pipe lines; yet more than 70 percent of the "independent" supply of gas to pipe lines would still be subject to Federal regulation, as of course it should be.

The producers who control the greater part of this gas are impressively large companies. Let me list a few of them, ranked in the order of the volume of their interstate sales of gas in 1947:

Largest seller of gas to interstate pipe lines was Phillips Petroleum. Its assets at the end of last year totaled \$579,273,500; its gross operating revenues in 1948 were \$487,165,287.

Next in line is the Chicago Corp., with assets of \$41,490,000; followed by Republic Natural Gas Co., with assets of \$22,760,000.

Then we come to the fourth largest seller of interstate gas, Humble Oil & Refining Co., with assets of nearly \$900,000,000; and a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, whose assets exceed \$3,500,000,000.

Then follow in order the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Skelly Oil Co., Continental Oil Co., and Gulf Oil Corp., all large companies; and they rank among the 10 largest sellers of interstate gas.

These are the kind of companies that control the bulk of the gas, and that would be free to raise the price of gas if Federal regulation is terminated either by legislation or by removal of Leland Olds from the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?—and in this connection I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have sufficient additional time to cover the time required for this question.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I decline to yield further. I have yielded freely.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for just one more question?

Mr. MURRAY. I am merely bringing up this matter at this time because I have to leave the Senate, and will not be here for the debate. If it occurs, it will be after I leave.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Montana permit me to remind him that up to this hour the Federal Power Commission never has attempted to regulate any of these producers, and none of the regulation to which the Senator from Montana has referred has yet been implemented? Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. MURRAY. If it has not been, it should be.

Mr. KERR. Then it should be done by act of Congress, rather than by action of a Commission, should it not?

Mr. MURRAY. Not if it comes within the province of the Commission by reason of the law and the act setting it up.

Mr. KERR. But if the Commission has been in existence for 11 years and never has had that jurisdiction, would the Senator from Montana think it has that jurisdiction now, even though it never has had it heretofore?

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to look into that matter. But it seems to me that when some persons have possession of this great natural resource, which is of such tremendous value to the American people, they should not be allowed to profiteer from it, but there should be some way to control it and to prevent them from being unfair.

Mr. KERR. But the Senator referred to what would happen if the regulation came to an end, did he not?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. I am reminding the Senator of the fact that it has never started.

Mr. MURRAY. If that be true, I think the Senator probably is in a pretty good situation. That is a matter about which we shall learn more later, I suppose.

Mr. KERR. But if it has never started, I merely wanted the Senator to know that the tragedy he thought was about to happen if the regulation ended probably would not take place, in view of the fact that the regulation to which the Senator refers has never started.

Mr. MURRAY. If it has not started, I think it would be a great misfortune

to the American people that such a thing as this could be permitted to be put over in this country. It seems to me it would be a great injustice to the American people who want to get the benefit of natural gas, that someone in control of it should be able to hold them up by excessive prices and make profits which seem to me to be so utterly excessive and unjust as to be unconscionable.

Let us not have our eyes closed to these large facts of life by the array of small producers and royalty owners who make their case against Federal control while the real beneficiaries of the proposed action keep themselves discreetly out of sight.

In concluding this brief outline of the money stakes involved in the vote on confirmation of Leland Olds, I want to present a few facts to convince the Senate and the American people that this oil and gas industry which hopes to increase the value of its gas reserves by some \$10,000,000,000 is and has been a highly profitable one. Indeed it is probably the most profitable of the major industries of the country.

I turn to the monthly bulletin of the National City Bank of New York to find how this industry has fared during postwar years. I find in this bulletin a report for some 44 petroleum-products companies in the manufacturing field and for some 40 oil and gas companies in the mining and quarrying group.

The petroleum-products companies made total profits, after taxes, of \$597,000,000 in 1945, which, according to National City Bank, was equal to 8.8 percent of their net worth in that year.

In 1946 the profits of this group increased to \$770,000,000, which was equal to 10.7 percent of their net worth.

The 1947 profit figure jumped nearly half a billion to a total of \$1,216,000,000. This raised the return on net worth to 15.8 percent.

Last year, 1948, these petroleum products companies added nearly three-quarters of a billion to their profits, reporting a total of \$1,954,000,000, and a return of 22 percent on their net worth. I submit that they seem to have been doing very well indeed.

Now let us examine the postwar fortunes of the 44 oil and gas companies which National City Bank has selected for inclusion in its monthly bulletin.

In 1945 their profit after taxes totaled \$31,000,000. This gave them a return of 11.3 percent on net worth.

In 1946 they made \$36,000,000, or about 12½ percent on net worth.

In the following year, 1947, they almost doubled their profit. It reached \$70,000,000 and was equal to 20 percent of net worth.

Between 1947 and 1948 the profits reported for a somewhat larger number of companies in this category increased 75 percent, so that we can say that the group which started with \$31,000,000 profits in 1945, made about \$123,000,000 of profit in 1948—a fourfold increase in 3 years. Their 1948 profits were equal to 36 percent of their net worth. Again, I submit, we have here all the earmarks

of a profitable industry, a most extraordinarily profitable industry.

I recite these facts so that the Senate and the American people shall know something about the profit level from which these oil and gas companies start as they launch into the years of a great gas boom, which, if they succeed in their campaign to kill effective Federal regulation, will add \$10,000,000,000 to the value of their present gas reserves.

To conclude this brief sketch of the financial background of the immediate issue that is involved in the confirmation of Leland Olds, I append a table taken from the Federal Power Commission's report to the Senate on Senate bill 1498, and ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, table B was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE B.—Income available for common stock as percent of common stock and surplus (at end of year) of oil and gas companies selling large volumes of natural gas to interstate pipe lines

	1946	1947	1948
Barnsdall Oil Co.	17.8	25.6	31.6
Continental Oil Co.	12.8	18.4	25.8
Gulf Oil Corp.	12.0	17.6	20.0
Humble Oil & Refining Co.	14.7	22.2	27.7
Ohio Oil Co.	15.0	20.9	28.4
Phillips Petroleum Co.	8.9	11.9	18.7
Plymouth Oil Co.	17.6	28.7	37.9
Pure Oil Co.	12.1	13.8	23.6
Republic Natural Gas Co.	18.6	26.0	27.4
Shamrock Oil & Gas Co.	18.5	28.9	40.6
Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware	19.3	31.0	29.6
Shell Union Oil Corp.	11.6	19.5	29.5
Sinclair Oil Co.	8.9	14.1	21.2
Skelly Oil Co.	13.3	22.3	30.4
Sun Oil Co.	9.1	13.2	19.4
The Texas Co.	10.5	12.3	17.4
Tidewater-Associated Oil Co.	11.2	15.4	18.0
Union Oil Co. of California	5.7	10.7	16.3
Warren Petroleum Corp.	6.6	27.0	28.2

Mr. MURRAY. This table lists a number of oil and gas companies which sell large volumes of natural gas to interstate pipe lines. These would be among the important beneficiaries of any action by the Senate to remove from Federal jurisdiction the prices at which gas is sold to the pipe lines. It will be noted that these companies have been earning very substantial returns upon their net worth, but of course they will perform far more handsomely for their stockholders if they are freed of any control with respect to the price of gas. I call attention to the fact the rates of return in this table are computed upon stockholders' equity at the end of the year. In other words, they are conservatively computed, for they include a large part of the year's profit in the base against which the profit rate is calculated.

To summarize the postwar profit record of these companies as reported to date, I submit a final table which sets forth for each of them the value of capital stock and surplus on January 1, 1946, and the dollar profits, after taxes, earned in the three postwar years and ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, table C was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE C.—Percentage of common stock and surplus at Jan. 1, 1946, recouped through profits during 3-year period of 1946 to 1948, inclusive of oil and gas companies selling large volumes of natural gas to interstate pipe lines

	Common stock and surplus, Jan. 1, 1946	Income available for common stock			Total, 1946, 1947, and 1948	Ratio, 3-year income to Jan. 1, 1946, common stock and surplus
		1946	1947	1948		
						Percent
Barnsdall Oil Co.....	\$27,759,000	\$5,113,811	\$9,119,031	\$13,473,629	\$27,706,471	99.8
Continental Oil Co.....	135,578,261	19,013,899	31,356,664	54,216,729	104,587,292	77.1
Gulf Oil Corp.....	435,220,942	58,284,830	95,540,059	153,539,299	307,364,188	70.6
Humble Oil & Refining Co.....	444,578,707	71,831,758	124,106,877	186,068,579	382,007,214	85.9
Ohio Oil Co.....	111,040,000	18,253,236	29,161,496	49,333,158	96,747,890	87.1
Phillips Petroleum Co.....	235,214,878	22,625,151	40,893,647	72,390,997	136,149,795	57.9
Plymouth Oil Co.....	11,508,723	2,105,239	4,197,420	6,594,656	12,897,315	112.0
Pure Oil Co.....	156,157,795	14,895,791	18,984,899	39,459,966	73,340,656	47.0
Republic Natural Gas Co.....	8,423,838	1,779,404	3,040,034	3,947,002	8,766,440	104.1
Shamrock Oil & Gas Co.....	7,585,724	1,564,078	2,875,158	5,573,548	10,012,784	132.0
Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware.....	11,510,350	3,000,586	5,941,002	6,780,713	15,722,301	136.6
Shell Union Oil Corp.....	252,638,662	32,880,417	59,874,698	111,396,447	204,151,562	80.8
Sinclair Oil Co.....	291,114,866	27,607,645	48,776,125	81,048,602	157,432,372	54.1
Skelly Oil Co.....	65,824,565	10,108,765	21,090,936	38,914,350	70,114,051	106.5
Sun Oil Co.....	153,459,818	14,307,158	23,920,521	42,434,447	80,662,126	52.6
The Texas Co.....	597,918,359	71,089,267	106,312,617	165,980,980	343,382,864	57.4
Tidewater-Associated Oil Co.....	148,792,000	20,302,000	33,622,000	37,856,000	91,780,000	61.7
Warren Petroleum Corp.....	5,600,203	1,115,041	4,926,388	8,393,637	14,435,066	257.8
18 companies.....	3,099,926,691	395,878,076	663,739,572	1,077,642,739	2,137,260,387	68.9

Data from Moody's Industrials.

Mr. MURRAY. The last column of this table is especially interesting. It relates the total postwar profits earned by each company to the stockholders' equity at the beginning of the postwar period. What we find is that only one of these large sellers of natural gas has earned less than 50 percent of the equity with which it started this 3-year period. Six of them recouped between 50 and 75 percent of stockholders' equity at the beginning of the period. Five recouped from 75 to 100 percent; five more recouped from 100 to 150 percent; and one got back its original equity 2½ times.

For all 18 companies together, postwar earnings totaled close to 70 percent of their common stock and surplus at the start of the 3-year period. By far the most profitable of the 3 years was 1948, when aggregate profits, after taxes, topped \$1,000,000,000. This alone was equal to 33 percent of stockholders' equity on January 1, 1946.

Can there be any doubt about the profitability of this oil and gas industry which has projected its demand for release from Federal jurisdiction to the floor of the Senate, and which asks the Senate to remove Leland Olds from the Federal Power Commission to achieve this end?

Is there any shadow of justification in these facts which I have presented for the demand that is made upon the Senate by this industry—a demand which turns out upon examination to open the door to a gigantic bonanza of \$10,000,000,000 to be taken from the pockets of the users of gas and to be added to already swollen profits of the oil and gas industry?

Mr. President, in a very brief and preliminary way, I have set forth the nature and magnitude of the stake involved in the decision on the renomination of Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission.

The attempt to shift the issue from the price of gas is not going to succeed.

For one thing, the press is on to it. Many of the country's commentators and editorial writers have penetrated to the real issue.

The farmers are on to it. Labor is on to it. State commissions and the municipal law officers, who know the great service Commissioner Olds has rendered consumers and the cause of conservation, are on to it.

As proof of this, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks certain press clippings, including news reports and editorial comment, as follows:

First. The leading editorial in the newspaper Labor, October 8, 1949, published by the 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations, headed "Power and Gas Trusts asking Senate to crucify Olds—purpose of 'Red smear' is to terrorize other conscientious public officials."

Second. Editorial in the New York Times, October 8, 1949, headed "The Olds nomination" and saying that—

What Mr. Olds wrote and thought then is far less important than what he has done as Chairman and member of the Federal Power Commission since then. His most recent notable public activity was to have objected last spring to proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act which, in his view, would have removed the producers of natural gas from the domain of Federal regulation.

Third. Editorial from the El Paso Herald-Post, October 4, 1949, headed "FPC appointment," and saying:

The gas interests and their brothers-in-law, the electric utilities, don't like Commissioner Olds because he's the people's man. They want a man of their own. * * * Mr. Olds is one of five Commissioners. He does not control the FPC, but he does speak up for Juan Smith. We hope the Senate confirms him.

Fourth. Editorial from the Muskegon Chronicle, September 23, 1949, headed "Gas users concerned."

Fifth. A syndicated article, On the Other Hand, by Lowell Mellett, from the Washington Star, October 4, 1949.

Sixth. Editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, October 4, 1949, headed "Confirm Leland Olds," and saying:

Natural gas, and natural gas alone, is the point at issue in Representative LYLE's outrageous attack on Olds' nomination.

Seventh. Editorial from the Kansas City Times, September 9, 1949, headed "Punishing Public Service," and saying:

We have heard of no case that could be made against Olds except vigorous action under the present law which was written by Congress. His sin is doing his duty as he saw it.

Eighth. Editorial from the Kansas City Star, October 6, 1949, headed "A record versus Olds writings," and saying:

The real reason for this attack is not what he [Olds] wrote in the twenties. It is part of the general drive of the natural-gas industry to weaken Federal control over the price of gas at the wells.

Ninth. Editorial from the Raleigh News and Observer, October 2, 1949, headed "Do lobbies rule?" and saying:

The lobbyists are arrogantly and brazenly demanding that the very Commission set up to regulate the interests the lobbyists represent be stacked with men biased in favor of those interests. Mr. Olds' one crime is that he has represented the public rather than the special interests. The Senate is itself on trial in this case.

Tenth. Editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times, October 3, 1949, headed "On-slaught against Olds," and saying that:

Olds is a man who puts the public interest above private gain. He is a man who believes the natural resources of this Nation were meant for the Nation as a whole, not the gain of a few. He is a man who thinks that a return to the utility scandals of the twenties would be ruinous for this Nation. Because of these things some utility interests oppose him now. It is just because of these things that the Senate should quickly confirm him for his new appointment.

Eleventh. Article from the League Reporter, October 10, 1949, published by Labor's League for Political Education, of the American Federation of Labor, headed "Low-rate exponent—Workers await Senate verdict on Olds—Enemies use smear tactics" and saying:

This is the case against Olds: He has championed the consumers' interests in low utility rates. He has refused to bow to the demands of the Power Trust for high rates and tremendous profits. The "He's a Communist" smear technique is being used by the gas and oil interests. This is the way the utilities are attacking Olds: In the 1920's he wrote articles for Federated Press, a labor news service. One of the clients of FP was the Daily Worker, the Communist paper published in New York. Therefore, Olds is a Communist. By that same sort of ridiculous reasoning, President Hugh Baillie, of the United Press, must be a Communist because he sells his service to the Daily Worker.

Twelfth. Article from the CIO News, October 10, 1949, headed "CIO, administration gear to fight to confirm Olds," and saying:

CIO's position was stated in a letter to all Senators from President Murray. It said: "The issue is oil. If the oil industry succeeds in removing Olds from the Power Commission, it will have gained a major victory in its campaign to escape Federal regulation of the prices it charges for natural gas. The stakes are enormous. Through increased prices of gas at least \$8,000,000,000 will be added to the value of oil companies' known gas reserves. Consumers will pay hundreds of millions of dollars a year in higher gas bills."

Thirteenth. Article from New York Times, October 8, 1949, headed "Renaming of Olds demanded by NCA," and saying:

The National Coal Association yesterday endorsed the reappointment of Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission.

Fourteenth. Article from the Machinist, September 29, 1949, published by the International Association of Machinists, headed "Knife out for Lee Olds: He fought to keep your gas, light bills down," and saying:

Whether or not Leland Olds is confirmed by the Senate will determine the size of those monthly light and gas bills that every family will be paying for years to come—

IAM President Al Hayes told the Machinist.

Fifteenth. Article from United Automobile Workers, October 1949, published by the UAW-CIO, headed "Hatchet job on Truman appointee—Oil companies want free hand to pick gas consumers' pockets," and saying:

Two sitting Commissioners have said the present law can be interpreted to give the oil companies what they want. Two other Commissioners won't let the oil companies get away with it, unless Congress changes the law. Olds goes along with these two. His reappointment would give the public viewpoint a majority on the Commission. That is why Olds was called Communist, traitor, menace, and many other choice words by the oil industry in these hearings. If they can't get the law they want, the next best thing is to get the Commission that administers the law. More than the billions of dollars of oil profit are involved. If the oil industry can kick a competent and courageous man like Olds out of public service, all Government administrators will be given notice that they had better be nice to big business if they want to keep their jobs.

Sixteenth. Article from the Washington Daily News, October 4, 1949, by Eleanor Roosevelt, headed, "Why can't Senators recognize honest public servants?" and saying:

By and large the people of the United States are not so gullible. They want the kind of public servant that Leland Olds has proved himself to be in the Federal Power Commission.

Seventeenth. Three editorials from the Washington Post, September 29, September 30, and October 7, 1949, headed "Lobby target," "Radical pasts," and "Sham battle."

Eighteenth. Editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 7, 1949, headed "Leland Olds and St. Louis," and saying:

His (Olds') record on the FPC shows that he has been a supporter of private enterprise, but enterprise kept within reasonable bounds by respect for the interests of the consumer. Mr. Truman knows that the consumers of the United States expect his administration to continue this watchfulness. He knows that if the Democratic majority in the Senate fails to confirm Leland Olds, its Members will be held responsible for higher utility bills. The President does not want the Democratic Party to carry that responsibility. He is right.

Nineteenth. Article from the Washington Star, September 28, 1949, headed "Public servant on trial" by Thomas L. Stokes.

Twentieth. Article from the Washington Star, October 1, 1949, headed "On the other hand," by Lowell Mellett.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor of October 8, 1949]

POWER AND GAS TRUSTS ASKING SENATE TO CRUCIFY OLD—PURPOSE OF RED SMEAR IS TO TERRORIZE OTHER CONSCIENTIOUS PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Will the Senate let the Power Trust and Natural Gas Trust crucify Leland Olds, and thereby terrorize other public officials into putting private interests above the public interest?

That was the real issue at Senate Interstate Commerce Committee hearings, when hostile witnesses—rounded up by the power and gas lobbies—attempted to smear Olds as a Red. If he were a Red, this paper would be fighting his confirmation. But he isn't a Red. Just a decent public servant who can't be fixed. Now the issue is up to the Senate.

From 1931 to 1939, Olds was a member of the New York State Power Authority, an electric utility regulating body. Then President Roosevelt, who had been Governor of New York and knew Olds' work there, appointed him to the Federal Power Commission, which regulates the interstate electric and gas industries. Now President Truman asks the Senate to approve his reappointment for another term.

Olds' record as a public regulator has been an open book for nearly two decades. Witnesses favoring his reappointment testified he has saved the American people many millions of dollars by helping to reduce electric and gas rates. His opponents choose to ignore the record and indulge in one of the dirtiest attacks ever made on any public official.

Even some conservative daily newspapers objected to hitting below the belt when an attempt was made to hang the Red label on Olds, by saying he once wrote for the Daily Worker, the Communist paper.

Olds explained that, years ago, he wrote articles for the Federated Press, which sold its news service to labor papers. The Daily Worker bought that service, and Olds had no choice as to where his articles appeared.

Next, Olds' opponents tried to paint him Red by recalling that he has advocated public ownership of electric power.

That kind of argument would make Communists out of both T. R. and F. D. Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, the late Senator Norris, and many other great Americans who believed in and worked for public-ownership programs.

Olds' principal opponents were spokesmen for the big oil companies and their natural gas subsidiaries. They want to force Olds out of the FPC, because he has opposed a bill which would largely free the gas concerns from any kind of regulation, Federal or State, enabling them to raise their rates to consumers by many millions of dollars a year.

In short, the electric power and gas interests wish to control the Federal Power Commission, which is supposed to regulate them. They are afraid of Leland Olds because they can't control him. That's the best reason in the world why he should be confirmed.

[From the New York Times of October 8, 1949]

THE OLD'S NOMINATION

Around the renomination of Leland Olds to serve a third term as member of the Federal Power Commission there swirls a double-barreled controversy. It threatens to eclipse the really pertinent question: Do Mr. Olds' present views and his record as

commissioner for the past decade warrant his reappointment?

The hearings of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which culminated in an unfavorable vote on Mr. Olds' renomination, centered not on this important issue, but rather on the allegation that Mr. Olds had given vent to bitterly anticapitalistic views more than 20 years ago. In his letter to the President explaining the adverse vote, Senator Johnson, chairman of the committee, offered no concrete evidence that Mr. Olds was unfit other than quotations from his writings, none of which was dated later than January 24, 1929. Admittedly, the views Mr. Olds then expressed sound radical today. But what Mr. Olds wrote and thought then is far less important than what he has done as Chairman and member of the Federal Power Commission since then. His most recent notable public activity was to have objected last spring to proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act which, in his view, would have removed the producers of natural gas from the domain of Federal regulation. The battle over his confirmation, if there was to be one, should have been fought on the issue of whether, as commissioner, he will properly serve the intent of Congress and the best interests of the Nation. That is what the Senate ought to debate next week when the Olds nomination comes to the floor.

On the other hand, we think the tack President Truman has taken toward those Democratic Senators who sincerely oppose the Olds nomination is unfortunate. While the President certainly has every right to fight for his nominee, the Senate, too, has the constitutional duty of approving or disapproving the nomination. To place confirmation of this appointment on mere grounds of party loyalty, and to imply that any Democratic Senator who opposes it is ipso facto a traitor to his party, hardly does justice to the qualifications of the appointee. Mr. Olds should be considered on his merits, neither on the false issue of communism nor on the foolish one of party discipline.

[From the El Paso Herald-Post of October 4, 1949]

FPC APPOINTMENT

The utilities, particularly the natural gas interests, are staging a knock-down fight in Washington to prevent Senate confirmation of Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission. He has served one term.

The gas interests and their brothers-in-law, the electric utilities, don't like Commissioner Olds because he's the people's man. They want a man of their own. They would make the FPC a creature of the utilities as the Interstate Commerce Commission has been made a creature of the railroads.

Mr. Olds got in bad with gas last year when he reported on the Commission's Nation-wide gas investigation.

He said that if the gas reserves of Texas and other Southwestern States were tied up to supply the industrial areas of the remainder of the Nation, the effect would be to:

1. Take away raw materials from which literally thousands of materials and products can be processed.
2. Cause fuels and electric rates to skyrocket.
3. Put an end to the hope of industrialization.
4. Consign such States to a permanent raw-material status.
5. Doom the people of the have-not States to continued low purchasing power and poor living standards (Texas ranks thirty-third among the States in per capita income, New Mexico, thirty-eighth).
6. Make it impossible to absorb into industrial activities within the State the surplus farm population created by mechanization; and

7. Create unwise and unnecessary migration.

Commissioner Olds' report containing the above findings was 323 pages, but his text was in this one paragraph:

"We are dealing here with an important factor, not only in the ambition of the Southwest to build up industrially, but also in the national interest in industrial decentralization through the widest possible dispersion of manufacture and population. To achieve these allied objectives, policies must be promoted which will bring about the development of manufacture in areas heretofore predominantly raw-material producers. Such policies will include the conservation of the exhaustible natural gas resources of the Southwest, because the reserve would hamstring industrial development in that region while encouraging further centralization of industry in the great coal-producing region of the northeastern industrial belt."

Coming to the aid of the natural gas industry, and its cheering section, the electric power boys, are a number of Texas Congressmen, including K. M. REGAN, of the El Paso district, and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

They have advanced no sound argument against Mr. Olds. They have turned to shedding tears for "the poor farmer" who, they claim, can't get full price for his gas if Mr. Olds stays on the Commission and the successor to the Rizley bill, defeated last session, is not passed.

Utilities act strangely when possible regulation of their rates comes up. An honest reflection on the record would show them that regulation—Federal, State, and municipal—has through the years meant sounder and more profitable business for them. They have been taught that low prices and high quality mean increased profit and increased good will. El Paso Natural Gas Co., for example, had its rates cut \$500,000. Among the beneficiaries were the citizens of El Paso. A greater beneficiary was the company itself, which went ahead at the lower rates and sold more and more gas to its old and new customers. An expertly managed outfit, we doubt if it would raise rates if it could. But there are many that can't see beyond the price per thousand cubic feet.

Mr. Olds is one of five Commissioners. He does not control the FPC, but he does speak up for Juan Smith.

We hope the Senate confirms him.

[From the Muskegon Chronicle of September 23, 1949]

GAS USERS CONCERNED

Greater Muskegon gas consumers are directly concerned in the fight now being waged in the United States Senate against the Federal Power Commission, and particularly against Commissioner Leland Olds, whose term has expired.

The issue is whether the Commission shall continue to regulate the rates paid for gas at the well, when it moves in interstate commerce, or whether this power shall pass to the States as proposed in a bill introduced by Senator KERR, of Oklahoma.

The Muskegon division of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. has over 22,000 meters installed. In the past 30 days more than 2,500 users petitioned the gas company for gas for house-heating purposes. Since our gas comes from the Texas-Hugoton fields, we have a direct interest in the price of gas at the well.

Senator KERR is rated as a multimillionaire. The bulk of his wealth comes from gas wells. It is understandable that he should prefer to have the States of Texas and Oklahoma fix the price of gas sold to outstate consumers.

What is less understandable is that he, in his position of United States Senator, should seek to drive from public office an individual who feels the Federal Government should regulate these prices in the interest of the consuming public.

Senator KERR is seeking to remove Mr. Olds, who has served for 12 years on the Commission, most of the time as Chairman.

Olds has been serving without pay since his term expired June 22, largely because Senator KERR and a few of his friends are doing their utmost to block approval of his reappointment. President Truman sent his name to the Senate more than 3 months ago. After persistent stalling, the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has finally scheduled hearings for Tuesday, September 27.

One of the charges leveled against Olds is that he is identified with subversive groups. Such a charge, coming after 12 years of outstanding public service including his opinion in the Michigan gas pipe-line case, illustrates the lengths to which certain vested interests will go.

Senator KERR and his cohorts have done business a grave disservice in using their official positions to serve their private interests in seeking to block Mr. Olds' reappointment.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of October 4, 1949]

CONFIRM LELAND OLDS

Leland Olds, nominated for a third 5-year term on the Federal Power Commission, is being made the victim of a merciless and unjustified attack by the natural gas lobby.

Spearheaded by Representative LYLE (Democrat of Texas), opponents are accusing Olds of Communist sympathies, radical beliefs and have even dragged in the old bromides that he is opposed to the home, the family and the church.

These charges, which were fought over and disproved when Olds was renominated in 1944 and when he was first nominated in 1939, are patently ridiculous. As a young man Olds was a labor writer. He held admitted leftist views—but not Communist views. He wrote with a labor viewpoint. His articles for the Federated Press were reprinted in leftist papers. Those things are matters of record and Olds has never hidden them before any committee considering his nomination. They were views not uncommon to many thinking young men.

Olds has matured. He is a liberal, but certainly not a radical. He has had almost 20 years of utility regulation experience, 8 of them as a member of the New York State Power Authority and 10 as a Federal Power Commissioner. As a Federal Power Commissioner, he has, in the words of Thomas C. Buchanan, a fellow Commissioner, been "a watchdog of the public welfare, which to some people makes him a dangerous radical." He has aroused the indignation of utility interests by his constant insistence on wringing water out of utility accounts and keeping down utility rates.

Olds' current crime is that he opposes bills, such as the Moore-Rizley measure, which have attempted to remove independent producers of natural gas from Federal Power Commission control. That would take about three-quarters of the industry out from under any effective rate control and send natural gas rates skyrocketing. So far Congress has refused to grant such immunity to the natural gas industry. In the interests of consumers it will have to continue to refuse it.

Natural gas, and natural gas alone, is the point at issue in Representative LYLE's outrageous attack on Olds' nomination. Communism and all the other charges are pure smear tactics. Attacks like this on able public servants are major reasons for the reluctance of good men to take Government posts of responsibility. The Senate, as it has on two previous occasions in the case old Olds, should show its disapproval of such tactics by confirming him for a third term.

[From the Kansas City Times of September 9, 1949]

PUNISHING PUBLIC SERVICE

Human memory and gratitude are short, but a few persons in this area have reason to remember Leland Olds. He is the strong man of the Federal Power Commission who stepped into the 15-year-old battle for lower gas rates in this region and won.

Since last June his reappointment to the Commission has been held up by a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas. It so happens that Texas is one of the gas-producing States leading the fight to undermine the authority of the Federal Power Commission. JOHNSON, who went into the Senate as a liberal (Texas version) has appeared to be very much on the side of the pipe-line companies.

This looks like a drive to get at the Power Commission one way or the other. If its control can't be weakened by a new law, then the next best thing (for the big companies) is to block the man who has been carrying out the intentions of the present law.

We have heard of no case that could be made against Olds except vigorous action under the present law which was written by Congress. His sin is doing his duty as he saw it.

One of his greatest sins, no doubt, came in this area. When the authority of the Federal Power Commission came into the old gas rate fight the public saw results in an amazingly short time.

From impounded funds out of that case the Kansas City gas users received checks totaling nearly \$8,000,000. Throughout the Cities Service system the refunds aggregated \$24,000,000, most of it in western Missouri and Kansas.

Since that time the Kansas City public has continued to receive the benefit of the rate reduction to the tune of more than \$2,000,000 a year (four and a half million for the system).

After all this saving for the public the pipe-line company has continued to make a good income by utility standards. The only complaints come from the fact that the pipe-line companies in general think they should make a speculative profit from the increased real value of their own wells.

The real issue is in the Kerr bill, which would remove the authority of the Commission from the producing end of the pipe lines. We believe the bill would be very expensive to gas users, but if the natural-gas Senators can win in an open fight that's that.

The sneak play against Olds is entirely different. The Senate subcommittee probably knows that it doesn't have a single honest reason to justify holding up his appointment. It hasn't risked bringing the name out on the floor of the Senate. The play is to do absolutely nothing and thereby punish a man for the sin of working in the public interest—as the present law provides.

[From the Kansas City Star of October 6, 1949]

A RECORD VERSUS OLD WRITINGS

Leland Olds now appears to have little chance of Senate confirmation after the one-sided adverse vote of the Commerce Committee. Here is an unusual situation of an important public official being blocked on the record of indiscretions of 20 years ago—not on his record in office.

As the dominant force on the Federal Power Commission Olds deserves a large share of the credit for the present low price of gas in this area and the millions of dollars in refunds that went back to the gas users. Since this tremendous saving for the public was accomplished Cities Service has still managed to show excellent earnings.

The city administration of Kansas City was active as an intervenor in this case. It

was just as tough as the Federal Power Commission in upholding the rights of the gas users and we have not yet heard it accused of being Communist or even pink.

The case against Olds was based on his writings in the 1920's. At that time he was on the staff of the Federated Press. According to former Senator E. H. Moore of Oklahoma the press service was a Communist organization with Earl Browder and William Z. Foster serving on its board. Its service was used by the Daily Worker and Olds' column was published in that Communist paper.

Olds has denied that he ever was a Communist and there is nothing in his selected writings (apparently assembled by the natural gas interests) to identify him as a Communist. But his attacks on the performance of capitalism and bouquets for the Soviet Union were enough to make him "hot" in this current uprising against all Communist activities.

Of course excerpts can be very misleading. And this country as a whole was very slow coming to its present appraisal of Soviet Russia. Olds did his writing so long ago that it might easily be charged to an addled youth and since outgrown. But his opponents have been able to use their material at a time when it can cause Olds the greatest possible damage.

The fact is, there is no taint of communism in his record on the Federal Power Commission. He has been a capable and we believe generally reasonable public official. The real reason for this attack is not what he wrote in the 1920's. It is part of the general drive of the natural gas industry to weaken Federal control over the price of gas at the wells. This objective is in the Kerr bill which hasn't yet succeeded.

We don't like Olds' writing of 20 years ago either, and they don't help our feelings about his emotional stability. But when a man has since served many years in responsible public office it is the record in office that should count on confirmation. From the standpoint of the consumers his record has been excellent.

[From the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., of October 2, 1949]

DO LOBBIES RULE?

Seldom, if ever, has a more clear-cut issue been presented to the United States Senate than that involved in the impending nomination of Leland Olds for another term on the Federal Power Commission.

The Washington Post, which is a frequent critic of the Truman administration, presents the case succinctly and fairly in the following editorial headed "Lobby Target":

"Leland Olds, nominated by the President to serve another term as member of the Federal Power Commission, is in danger of being rejected by the Senate because he has had the temerity to oppose the powerful natural gas lobby. He was known to be an opponent of the Moore-Rizley bill which passed the House but died in the Senate during the Eightieth Congress. He testified vigorously before the House and Senate Interstate Commerce Committees in opposition to the similar bills before the present Congress. These bills would amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 in such a way as to remove from regulation of the Federal Power Commission all the independent producers of natural gas—about three-fourths of the industry. The effect would be to deprive consumers of the protection afforded by Federal rate fixing and make them the victims of a price gouge by an already profitable industry.

"Mr. Olds has had nearly two decades of experience in utility regulation. He served the New York State Power Authority from 1931 to 1939, when President Roosevelt named him to the Federal Power Commission. On that body, where he has completed two 5-year terms, he has been vigilant in

squeezing the water out of utility accounts and vigorous in pressing for gas and electric rate reductions. Testifying in his behalf on Tuesday, Ordway Tead, chairman of New York City's Board of Higher Education, observed that 'if, as some allege, there is a disposition to have men serving on this Commission whose first loyalty is to some lesser private interest, then Mr. Olds is not your man. He has served and will serve one interest only—that of all the plain people of America.'"

It is clear that there is a disposition, at least among the utility lobbyists, to have men on the Commission whose loyalty is to private interest. This disposition was evident in the opposition to Mr. Buchanan's confirmation as a Commission as well as in the opposition to Mr. Olds. It was evident in Representative LYLE's despicable and preposterous attempt to smear Mr. Olds as a Red because he worked and wrote for labor unions 20 years ago. The Senate can best demonstrate its own devotion to the public interest by confirming Mr. Olds at once.

The lobbyists are arrogantly and brazenly demanding that the very Commission set up to regulate the interests the lobbyists represent be stacked with men biased in favor of those interests.

Mr. Olds' one crime is that he has represented the public rather than the special interests.

The Senate is itself on trial in this case. This nomination should not be pigeonholed by a committee. It should be brought to a vote in the Senate and the roll call should be called on that vote.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of October 3, 1949]

ONSLAUGHT AGAINST OLDS

For 10 years now Leland Olds has been the most publicly prominent member of the Federal Power Commission. And he has won that prominence by no spectacles of flamboyance, no off-the-handle excesses. He has won it by the simple process of being tirelessly intelligent in the service of the public. There have been few enough headlines to herald his success in that service; FPC decisions are complicated things that deal with the tangles of utility-rate cases and boundaries of jurisdiction, so they make anything but light reading. Experts in the utility field, though, have come to recognize Olds as one of their own. He knows his subject thoroughly, deeply, and he has used his knowledge to the benefit of the consumers.

Yet Leland Olds today is literally fighting for his official life. Renominated by President Truman for a third richly deserved term on the Commission, he has run into powerful opposition. It is, as was to be expected, public-utility opposition. The men Olds has resisted in their attempts to encroach on the public are the men who now fight him with every weapon at hand. But the force such men can yield in the Senate is no less strong for being a strictly private, strictly entrenched-interest force.

There are some weird charges being brought against Olds. Typical of them is the one that he is a Communist, or at least a Communist sympathizer. "Olds' articles," it is whispered about, "used to appear in the Daily Worker. You know what that means." And his articles did so appear—at a time when he was writing for the Federated Press, a trades-union press syndicate, back in the twenties. Olds had no more responsibility for or connection with Daily Worker policy than an Associated Press reporter today has responsibility for Star-Times policy. What's more, he has been consistently vigorous in his opposition to communism. There are even competent authorities, men like former Assistant Secretary of State Berle, to testify that Olds has been a prime champion against communism and socialism; by the policies he espoused, these authorities say,

Olds has preserved private enterprise in the utility field from excesses that would otherwise have led to collectivism in some form.

Olds is no Communist. But he is a man who puts the public interest above private gain. He is a man who believes the natural resources of this Nation were meant for the Nation as a whole, not the gain of a few. He is a man who thinks that a return to the utility scandals of the twenties would be ruinous for this Nation. Because of these things some utility interests oppose him now. It is just because of these things that the Senate should quickly confirm him for his new appointment.

[From the A. F. of L. League Reporter of October 10, 1949]

LOW-RATE EXPONENT—WORKERS AWAIT SENATE VERDICT ON OLDS—ENEMIES USE SMEAR TACTICS

Millions of Americans are awaiting the Senate's verdict on Leland Olds. All the testimony is in. The lower court—the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—has given its verdict. Now the case is in the hands of the highest court—the Senate itself.

Olds, who has been a member of the Federal Power Commission for 10 years, has been renominated by President Truman for another 5-year term. A week of hearings on the nomination has been completed by the Senate subcommittee.

UNANIMOUS VOTE

On October 4 the subcommittee voted unanimously, 7 to 0, against Olds. And on October 5 the full committee voted 10 to 2 to turn down Olds. The Senate still must act on the nomination.

These 10 members of the committee voted against Olds and against your interests:

LINE-UP

Five Democrats: JOHNSON (Colorado), McFARLAND (Arizona), O'CONNOR (Maryland), JOHNSON (Texas), and HUNT (Wyoming). Five Republicans: TOBEY (New Hampshire), REED (Kansas), BREWSTER (Maine), CAPEHART (Indiana), and BRICKER (Ohio).

Two Democrats, MAGNUSON (Washington) and MYERS (Pennsylvania), voted for Olds and your interests. One Democrat, McMAHON (Connecticut), was unable to be present at the meeting and has not yet announced his position on Olds.

CASE AGAINST OLDS

This is the case against Olds:

He has championed the consumers' interests in low utility rates. He has refused to bow to the demands of the power trust for high rates and tremendous profits.

The "He's a Communist!" smear technique is being used by the gas and oil interests.

This is the way the utilities are attacking Olds: In the 1920's he wrote articles for Federated Press, a labor news service. One of the clients of the FP was the Daily Worker, the Communist paper published in New York. Therefore, Olds is a Communist.

By that same sort of ridiculous reasoning, President Hugh Baillie, of the United Press must be a Communist because he sells his service to the Daily Worker.

[From the CIO News of October 10, 1949]

CIO, ADMINISTRATION GEAR FOR FIGHT TO CONFIRM OLDS

CIO joined the administration last week in a last-ditch fight to win Senate confirmation of Leland Olds, named by President Truman for a third term as head of the important Federal Power Commission.

Olds, under a barrage attack from gas and electric utility lobbies because of his consumer-minded regulation of rates charged by the companies, was turned down by a 10 to 2 vote of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Only Senator MYERS (Democrat, Pennsylvania), and Senator MAGNUSON (Democrat, Washington) voted for Olds.

The fight to overrule the Committee on the Senate floor received strong support from the Democratic National Committee. Chairman William Boyle, Jr., sent telegrams to heads of the party's State organizations asking them to let their Senator know that the people want Olds confirmed.

Boyle said that Olds, during his past 10 years' service on the Power Commission, has stood for the best interests of the general public in the public utility field. Defeat of his nomination would be a defeat for the millions of Americans who are entitled to fair power rates and a victory for the power lobbyists and the Republican Party.

Boyle's statement was backed up by President Truman, in the form of a letter to Senators and in outspoken remarks at his press conference. The President said that opposition to Olds comes from powerful corporations.

CIO's position was stated in a letter to all Senators from President Murray. It said:

"The issue is oil. If the oil industry succeeds in removing Olds from the Power Commission, it will have gained a major victory in its campaign to escape Federal regulation of the price it charges for natural gas. The stakes are enormous.

"Through increased prices of gas, at least \$8,000,000,000 will be added to the value of oil companies' known gas reserves. Consumers will pay hundreds of millions of dollars a year in higher gas bills.

"The vote of the Senate on Leland Olds will determine whether oil will again stain the public record.

"The President said: 'We cannot allow the great corporations to dominate the commissions which have been created to regulate them.'

"These are the real issues on which you will vote when the confirmation of Olds is before you."

Washington experts say that some \$2,000,000,000 are involved in the fate of the Olds appointment. As Chairman of the FPC, Olds has headed a 3-2 majority which has stood consistently for protection of the consumers in matters of gas and electric-power rates.

Defeat of Olds, and selection of a less militant or experienced person to the Commission, would be a tremendous victory for the power and gas interests—and it would undoubtedly spur industry demands by the industry's lobby for higher rates.

[From the New York Times of October 8, 1949]

RENAMING OF OLDS DEMANDED BY NCA—COAL GROUP'S FINAL SESSION FOR FPC REAPPOINTMENT ON "SOUND" STAND ON NATURAL GAS—OPPOSE SECURITY TAX RISE—PRODUCERS ADOPT A RESOLUTION FOR CONGRESS TO FIND FUNDS FOR PLAN SOME OTHER WAY

The National Coal Association yesterday endorsed the reappointment of Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission. Speaking at closing sessions of the bituminous-coal-producing industry's forty-second annual convention at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Charles A. Owen, NCA president, said coal producers feel that Commissioner Olds has been very sound in his treatment of natural-gas matters coming before the Commission. "We are hopeful that he will be continued in office," Mr. Owen said.

In the same statement Mr. Owen denied reports published by a Washington newspaper, which stated that coal producers had been opposed to the confirmation of Leland Olds. In rejecting this Washington story Mr. Owen said he did not know the source of the report and "I know of no foundation for it."

[From the Machinist of September 29, 1949]
KNIFE OUT FOR LEE OLDS—HE FOUGHT TO KEEP YOUR GAS, LIGHT BILLS DOWN

The International Association of Machinists this week threw the full weight of its support into the fight to win confirmation of Leland Olds, at right, whom President Truman has reappointed for a third term on the Federal Power Commission.

"Whether or not Leland Olds is confirmed by the Senate will determine the size of those monthly light and gas bills that every family will be paying for years to come," IAM President Al Hayes told the Machinist. "Olds has campaigned consistently against exorbitant electric and gas rates, and the power lobby is out to get him. If they succeed, the Government's regulation of utilities is going to be seriously weakened."

Olds was first appointed to the Federal Power Commission in 1939 by the late President Roosevelt. He served as chairman from 1940 to 1944 and was reappointed in 1945. During Olds' tenure the Power Commission has—

Forced the utility companies to squeeze \$1,400,000,000 water out of utility-company accounts, thus lowering the capitalization on which utility rates are based.

Established Supreme Court precedents fixing actual net investment, and not theoretical replacement cost, as the base for determining electric rates.

Established cooperative working arrangements under the law to enable State and city utility commissions to borrow competent Federal experts to help handle utility requests for rate increases.

In addition, Olds has openly announced himself in favor of river-basin development on the Tennessee Valley Authority pattern and is currently opposing the Kerr bill to exempt producers of natural gas from any Federal rate regulation.

Typical of the vigorous action Olds has taken to enforce utility regulations occurred in Kansas City in 1943 when Olds threw the authority of the Power Commission into a Midwestern gas-rate fight. As a result, gas users throughout the Cities Service System in western Missouri and Kansas received refunds adding up to \$24,000,000. They are still receiving the benefit of that rate reduction to the tune of more than \$4,500,000 a year. After all this saving for the public, the pipe-line company has continued to make a good income by utility standards.

Even his enemies concede that Leland Olds is one of the more competent administrators in the Government service.

To block Olds' reappointment, the electric and gas lobbies have succeeded in rigging the subcommittee of Senators who will make the recommendation to the Senate.

That committee is composed of Senators LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas; ED JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado; MCFARLAND, Democrat, Arizona; HERBERT R. O'CONOR, Democrat, Maryland; BRICKER, Republican, Ohio; CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana; and REED, Republican, Kansas.

To give these Senators an excuse to vote against Olds, the power lobby has dug into Olds' past and furnished the committee with some radical statements Olds wrote 25 years ago. In that period he was Director of Research for the Railway Employees Department, AFL during the 1922 railroad strike, and wrote economic articles for a labor news service which was supported by the International Association of Machinists and other trade unions.

The IAM agrees with the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which recently summed up the case against Leland Olds this way:

"Mr. Olds' offense is his unbroken record of zeal in the protection of the public."

[From the United Automobile Worker for October 1949]

HATCHET JOB ON TRUMAN APPOINTEE—OIL COMPANIES WANT FREE HAND TO PICK GAS CONSUMERS' POCKETS

WASHINGTON.—Consumers of natural gas are due for a beating if the oil companies win their campaign to kick Leland Olds out of the Federal Power Commission.

Twice appointed to the Commission by President Roosevelt, Olds was reappointed by President Truman last June. Senate action on confirmation is expected almost any day now. A Senate subcommittee has recommended rejection of Olds' appointment.

If the Senate turns Olds down, oil companies will have won a major victory in their drive to keep the Government from regulating prices at which they sell gas to pipe lines. Retail prices of gas in a large part of the country will be headed for high altitudes. Home owners who heat with gas will take such a licking they will wish they were still burning coal or oil.

SMEAR CAMPAIGN

At recent hearings before the hand-picked Senate subcommittee, Olds was subjected to a brutal barrage of character smears by oil-company witnesses and their like-minded Senators. For ferocity and unfairness the proceedings touched a new kind of low.

The hearings dramatically demonstrated that the issue is not Olds. It is gas. Opposition to Olds was all from the oil country, pleading for profits on natural gas. Oil industry lawyers were supplemented by spokesmen from four oil country universities, including the president of Texas Christian University.

Frankest of the four professors was Rupert Richardson, president of Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex., who said: "Central western Texas has for 30 years produced quantities of oil and gas. The university with which I have been associated for a third of a century could not have survived save for gifts which these industries made possible."

Backing Olds were CIO, IAM, Farmers' Union, National Grange, ADA, rural electrical cooperatives, many State utility commissions, city attorneys from Detroit, Pittsburgh and Kansas City, and a distinguished list of public-spirited citizens.

Camouflage in the subcommittee's attempt to beat Olds was a rehashing of articles he wrote for the Federated Press during the 1920's. The pieces, printed widely in labor papers, but also in the Daily Worker, slashed hammer and tongs at the union-busting open-shop industries of that day and called for radical reforms of that kind of capitalism. Like many mistaken liberals of that period, he looked with some hope toward the revolutionary changes abroad. Today, in a new setting, this makes fine fuel for reactionary Senators engaged in burning an honest and vigorous liberal, and they are pouring it on. But they have been unable to show that he advocated communism or sympathized with it in his program of reform for this country, although they have done their best to smear him with that brush.

WANT FREE HAND

Real reason why the oil industry and the oil country Senators want to beat Olds is to escape Government regulation of natural gas. Since 1947 the oil industry has tried, without success, to get a bill through Congress exempting gas sales from regulation. The Harris-Kerr bill in the present Congress has the same purpose, but if it passes it will be killed by a Presidential veto.

Oil companies know this. That's why they want to get Olds off the Federal Power Commission. Two sitting Commissioners have said the present law can be interpreted to give the oil companies what they want.

Two other Commissioners won't let the oil companies get away with it, unless Congress changes the law. Olds goes along with these two. His reappointment would give the public viewpoint a majority on the commission.

This is why Olds was called Communist, traitor, menace, and many other choice words by the oil industry in these hearings. If they can't get the law they want, the next best thing is to get the commission that administers the law.

More than the billions of dollars of oil profit are involved. If the oil industry can kick a competent and courageous man like Olds out of public service, all Government administrators will be given notice that they had better be nice to big business if they want to keep their jobs.

OIL STATE LINE-UP

Political line-up on Olds is top stuff. The President is backing him to the limit. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Texas Democrat, has not publicly spoken against Olds but he has spearheaded the oil industry legislative drive. Senators LYNDON JOHNSON, Texas; ED JOHNSON, Colorado; MCFARLAND, Arizona, all Democrats, and REED, Kansas Republican, are most openly active against Senate confirmation of Olds. Senator BOB KERR, Democrat, Oklahoma, oil millionaire and Sunday school teacher, is kingpin behind the scenes in the fight against Olds.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 4, 1949]

MY DAY—WHY CAN'T SENATORS RECOGNIZE HONEST PUBLIC SERVANTS?

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Monday.—When the special interests today find that they cannot quite carry their point against some public servant on the actual facts of a case, they are prone to fall back on the accusation that at some time in the individual's career he had a tie with communism.

At the present moment hearings are going on dealing with the reappointment for a third term of Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission. I knew Mr. Olds first when my husband was Governor of New York State. He started his battle then for sound utility and power policy as a representative of the community councils of the City of New York.

Mr. Olds' work must have been well done because it brought about changes in the State, and he helped with the report that recommended a program of effective regulation. This was later implemented by United States Supreme Court decisions secured by the Federal Power Commission when Mr. Olds, himself, was Chairman of the Commission.

It is easy to understand why the electric power companies are opposed to him. Any one familiar with his record sees quite well why the people from Texas or Oklahoma who are interested in oil and natural gas businesses are also opposed to him. Mr. Olds' opposition stopped the attempt in the 80th Congress to get amendments to the Natural Gas Act restricting the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction to the transportation, companies and the final interstate sale. Had the producers succeeded, it would have left the pipe-line company as well as the independent producers free to get an unregulated price at the start of the journey of gas to the consumer markets.

It is easy to see the tie of all those who are against Mr. Olds with their personal interests, or the interest of their State, or their business, or their friends. He has the backing, however, of such organization and individuals as the National Grange, the National Farmers' Union, the Rural Electric Cooperative Association, American Public Power Association, Municipal Law Officers Institute, the

CIO, the AFL, the ADA, railroad unions, four State regulatory commissions, and such individuals as Morris L. Cooke, Ordway Tead, James C. Bonbright, Adolf Berle, Jr., Jonathan Daniels, and others.

None of these organizations or people believe him to be communistic in his thinking. This is, of course, implied by his opponents because articles he had once written were distributed by a news service to newspapers including the Daily Worker. In addition, the horrible fact has been brought out that he once spoke on the same platform with Earl Browder.

I don't know what that proves, because Lowell Mellett found a picture of Earl Browder taken with four other men with whom he shared a platform. This is in Elizabeth Dilling's book, *The Roosevelt Red Record and Its Background*. Among these four men is the Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT.

Can't our Senators and Representatives see through this opposition and recognize honest public servants? Must they swallow such an obvious red-herring allegation of communism?

By and large, the people of the United States are not so gullible. They want the kind of public servant that Leland Olds has proved himself to be in the Federal Power Commission. I hope they will speak out now when he needs their backing—in no uncertain terms.

[From the Washington Post of September 29, 1949]

LOBBY TARGET

Leland Olds, nominated by the President to serve another term as member of the Federal Power Commission, is in danger of being rejected by the Senate because he has had the temerity to oppose the powerful natural gas lobby. He was known to be an opponent of the Moore-Rizley bill which passed the House but died in the Senate during the Eightieth Congress. He testified vigorously before the House and Senate Interstate Commerce Committees in opposition to the similar bills before the present Congress. These bills would amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 in such a way as to remove from regulation of the Federal Power Commission all the independent producers of natural gas—about three-fourths of the industry. The effect would be to deprive consumers of the protection afforded by Federal rate fixing and make them the victims of a price gouge by an already profitable industry.

Mr. Olds has had nearly two decades of experience in utility regulation. He served the New York State Power Authority from 1931 to 1939, when President Roosevelt named him to the Federal Power Commission. On that body, where he has completed two 5-year terms, he has been vigilant in squeezing the water out of utility accounts and vigorous in pressing for gas and electric rate reductions. Testifying in his behalf on Tuesday, Ordway Tead, chairman of New York City's Board of Higher Education, observed that "If, as some allege, there is a disposition to have men serving on this Commission whose first loyalty is to some lesser private interest, then Mr. Olds is not your man. He has served and will serve one interest only—that of all the plain people of America."

It is clear that there is a disposition, at least among the utility lobbyists, to have men on the Commission whose loyalty is to private interest. This disposition was evident in the opposition to Mr. Buchanan's confirmation as a Commissioner as well as in the opposition to Mr. Olds. It was evident in Representative LYLE's despicable and preposterous attempt to smear Mr. Olds as a Red because he worked and wrote for labor unions 20 years ago. The Senate can best demonstrate its own devotion to the public interest by confirming Mr. Olds at once.

[From the Washington Post of September 30, 1949]

RADICAL PASTS

A great deal of fuss—most of it as synthetic as it is silly—has been raised in the Senate hearings on confirmation of Leland Olds to the Federal Power Commission because the nominee expressed some opinions in the 1920's which sound very bad in 1949. His predicament or embarrassment is not unique. Many a respectable lawyer, doctor, merchant chief, as well as Government administrator, has sown ideological wild oats in his salad days which he might find it awkward to explain in his maturity. But this is, in point of fact, no more than an indication of healthy growth on the part of an intelligent and inquiring mind.

As a young man, Mr. Olds was very impatient with the social injustices which, it is now generally acknowledged, were widespread in the United States during the first quarter of the twentieth century. He thought that industrial workers were entitled to a living wage and that laissez-faire capitalism should be sharply curbed; he was an enthusiastic labor-union man and bitterly fought the open-shop policies of industrial management. With this background, he began in 1922 to write a column for the Federated Press which served a number of labor newspapers. One of the clients of the Federated Press was the Daily Worker; but to say that Mr. Olds wrote for the Daily Worker because that Communist house organ published his pieces is to strike a blow very far below the belt. It would be as reasonable to condemn a reporter for the United Press because the Daily Worker receives and uses that wire service.

Mr. Olds said some extravagant things in his column 25 years ago. Taken out of context and looked at in the light of today's relationship between right and left, they may be made to seem extremely radical. But the social conditions of 25 years ago invited radicalism. A man could denounce open-shop capitalism in those days without being called a Communist or considered disloyal to the United States. The elder La Follette did so, and Mr. Olds supported his candidacy in 1924. On the whole, the resurrection of Mr. Olds' ancient writings is by no means discreditable to him. They make him appear to have been what might now be called, to paraphrase a term in current usage, a member of the noncapitalist right. Like many a young man, he was in a great hurry to reform the world and seems to have taken the Sermon on the Mount somewhat too literally for contemporary digestion. We hope he has not settled down too thoroughly.

[From the Washington Post of October 7, 1949]

SHAM BATTLE

It would have been embarrassing, to be sure, but still it would have been respectable, if the Senate Commerce Committee had rejected Leland Olds as a member of the Federal Power Commission on the candid ground that he has been stubborn in his opposition to the utility interests. But the proprieties, it appears, call for a greater measure of piety. Thus we have the spectacle of Senators shocked beyond description because more than 20 years ago Mr. Olds wrote disrespectfully, indeed sacrilegiously, about the Fourth of July.

Mr. Olds' disrespect for the oil and natural-gas lobbies, therefore, has nothing to do with the case. And President Truman was just wasting so much ink and paper when he wrote to Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON pointing out that "Mr. Olds is a nationally recognized champion of effective utility regulation," that "he has already served two full terms as a member of the Federal Power Commission," that "he has labored diligently in the service

of all the people and has earnestly sought to protect the public against the narrow interests of special groups." If the President could only show that Mr. Olds now sets off firecrackers fervently whenever Independence Day rolls round, he might get somewhere.

One can only hope that when Mr. Olds' name comes before the Senate as a whole that body will prove more profound and less chauvinistic, more interested in substance and less in symbols. It would be a good idea to make the fight over Mr. Olds' confirmation something more than a sham battle.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 7, 1949]

LELAND OLDS AND ST. LOUIS

St. Louis home owners should be especially interested in President Truman's fight to keep Leland Olds on the Federal Power Commission. They might be among the first to suffer if the Senate refuses to confirm his renomination. This is because so many of them are turning to natural gas as the source of their heat.

That natural gas comes from beyond the borders of Missouri. State and local agencies, therefore, cannot regulate its cost. That is up to the FPC, a sometimes divided body which Mr. Olds has tipped in favor of regulation to insure fair prices and fair profits. Today's Marquis Childs column and the article under the cartoon both point out that the utilities have not suffered under FPC regulation, and that consumers at the same time have saved millions of dollars.

There is, however, a utilities cabal headed by Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, which wants to make a killing. To that end, it is not only fighting against Olds, but also pressing for a law which would exempt natural gas production from Federal regulation. If this crowd wins out, St. Louisans may get bigger gas bills instead of lower ones. The Laclede Gas Co. will be helpless. If the natural gas producers hike their rates, the local distributor will have to pass along the increase, instead of giving consumers the benefit of a cheaper fuel.

Mr. Truman knows what this fight is about. He is not deceived by the Senate Commerce Committee's convenient discovery that Mr. Olds expressed some "radical" ideas a quarter of a century ago. His record on the FPC shows that he has been a supporter of private enterprise, but enterprise kept within reasonable bounds by respect for the interests of the consumer.

Mr. Truman knows that the consumers of the United States expect his administration to continue this watchfulness. He knows that if the Democratic majority in the Senate fails to confirm Leland Olds, its Members will be held responsible at the polls for higher utility bills. The President does not want the Democratic party to carry that responsibility. He is right.

[From the Washington Evening Star of September 26, 1949]

PUBLIC SERVANT ON TRIAL—OIL AND GAS INTERESTS SEEN OUT TO HANG LELAND OLDS IN SENATE UNIT HEARING

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It is often the secret maneuverings and manipulations of little groups of men, your elected public servants ostensibly, that decide great issues here that deeply and directly affect your public welfare.

There is another example here now in the attempt of some members of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee to defeat confirmation of a proved and outstanding champion of the public interests, Leland Olds, to another term on the Federal Power Commission.

Just to freshen the memory and get the perspective of the big issue involved, the

Federal Power Commission, established in 1930 during Herbert Hoover's administration, is charged with regulatory authority over electric and natural gas utilities to see that you, the consumer, pay fair rates for the services they render. Congress, representing you, passed the regulatory laws and created this Commission and delegated it authority to protect your interest.

TOO ALERT FOR INTERESTS

For 10 years, through two terms, Leland Olds has been alert to protect your interest—too alert, in fact, for powerful oil, natural gas and electric utility interests which are exerting all sorts of pressures to get him off the five-man Commission. Among other things, Mr. Olds has taken a stand against proposals in Congress sponsored by these interests to weaken existing statutes long ago passed by Congress—the 1920 Federal Waterpower Act affecting utility regulation and the 1938 Natural Gas Act—so that the FPC would be hampered in the necessary investigatory work preliminary to prescribing fair rates.

Mr. Olds is on trial at public hearings before a Senate Interstate Commerce Subcommittee which obviously is packed against him as an experienced observer here can plainly see. The plot, of course, is to hang him privately behind closed doors.

Southwestern oil and gas interests, dominant particularly in the politics of Oklahoma and Texas, are very active, as the list of witnesses against him reveals. Both States are very influential in this Democratic Congress.

Mr. Olds is testifying in his own defense, laboriously going over a whole life devoted to public service to refute the usual baseless sort of insinuations so carelessly made these days against progressive figures in public service. Outstanding men, nationally known for their expert knowledge of utilities and utility regulation and for their activity in behalf of fair treatment of the public, are appearing in his defense at their request. Representatives of interests which want to get rid of him likewise are appearing before the subcommittee which is headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat of Texas, hitherto regarded as a progressive who now is lined up against Mr. Olds and appearing somewhat uncomfortable in that role.

TERMED "OUTSTANDING"

The issue was well put by James C. Bonbright, professor of business and finance at Columbia University and chairman of the New York Power Authority, who praised Mr. Olds at the outset for his "magnificent job" on FPC and termed him "one of the most distinguished and outstanding men" in the field of public-utility regulation.

Professor Bonbright, a recognized authority, said that administration of FPC, to which Mr. Olds has made such a valuable contribution, has been so good that it has helped the private power industry, keeping it out of the dangers that were so manifest during its complacency of the 1920's. The abuses of that era, the watering of stocks, the siphoning off of profits through manipulations of holding company piled on top of holding company, the pernicious influence of utilities in politics—all these were revealed by the Federal Trade Commission's exhaustive 6-year investigation beginning in the late twenties. He doubted that the industry would want to return to those conditions.

No member of the Commission, he said, has done more than Leland Olds to maintain the vitality of the FPC.

"Millions of people," he concluded, "are paying millions less for public-utility services than they would have if it were not for the presence of Leland Olds on the Commission. At the same time the utility industry has been very healthy and prosperous."

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 1, 1949]

CRY OF "COMMUNISM" DOES NOT ANSWER QUESTIONS BEFORE SENATE

(By Lowell Mellett)

The weakness of the case against Leland Olds, nominated by the President for another term on the Federal Power Commission, was revealed when his senatorial opponents took up the cry of "communism."

Mr. Olds has been operating as a member of the Commission for 10 years and that means he has been operating in a glass house, subject to public scrutiny. The scrutiny has not been lacking. Representatives of the utilities regulated by FPC have watched his every move and made note of his every utterance, ready to run to their friends in Congress at the slightest slip on his part. Utility men among the Congressmen's constituents back home have done likewise.

In the course of those 10 years nothing said or done by Mr. Olds had caused him to be charged with communistic tendencies. At worst he was accused occasionally of being overzealous in the public interest and not sufficiently considerate of private property rights. That was the view expressed to me this week by Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, himself a natural-gas producer and one of Mr. Olds' most active opponents.

BASIS OF OPPOSITION

The Senator took an hour and a quarter of his time to spell out patiently and clearly the basis of his personal opposition. This related chiefly to the position now taken by Mr. Olds that sales of natural gas to the interstate pipe-line companies should be subject to Federal regulation rather than State regulation. The Senator offered documentary evidence to show that this represented a change of viewpoint on the part of Mr. Olds, one that rendered him unacceptable to any producer or gatherer of natural gas.

To hear what Mr. Olds would have to say in defense, I attended a subcommittee hearing on his nomination. Instead, however, of a debate or discussion of the gas-regulation issue, I found the hearing had been launched as a trial of Mr. Olds as an alleged former and perhaps unreformed Communist. The air was charged with emotion or a reasonable appearance of same. The subcommittee members were being shocked, to their manifest delight, by the testimony of Representative LYLE, of Texas, concerning articles written by Mr. Olds back in the twenties as a member of the Federated Press. The Federated Press merely had the Daily Worker as one of its subscribers in those days, most of the others being good non-Communist A. F. of L. newspapers, but the witness had little difficulty in identifying, to his own satisfaction, Mr. Olds with communism.

Not only were the subcommittee members shocked by what Mr. Olds had written, but there was something worse. The Daily Worker reported his appearance once on the same platform with Earl Browder, then chairman of the Communist Party. That really hit the Senators hard.

"SHOCKED," SAYS M'FARLAND

"I am shocked," said Senator M'FARLAND, of Arizona, "shocked beyond words." Which in the case of a Senator could be a third-degree shock, possibly fatal. But the sturdy Arizonian rose to his feet and departed for the Senate chamber, apparently not wishing to hear any more.

If Senator M'FARLAND had detoured by way of the Congressional Library and asked for a copy of Elizabeth Dilling's book, *The Roosevelt Red Record and Its Background*, he'd have got a shock that would have finished him. On page 59 he would have found a picture of Earl Browder taken with four men with whom he had just shared the platform

at a meeting of the American Youth Congress. And who is the smiling gentleman sitting in the middle? None other than the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT.

This, when he learns of it, will make it impossible for Senator McFARLAND to sit in Mr. TAFT's Senate, but it leaves unsettled the question of who should regulate the sale of natural gas.

THE ANNECY, FRANCE, TRADE AGREEMENT'S EFFECT ON UNITED STATES ECONOMY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there was released to the public today the tariff reductions agreed to by our representatives with other nations under the Trade Agreements Act at Annecy, France.

On September 13, the junior Senator from Nevada said in an address, at the time the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, then called the Trade Agreements Act of 1949, was up for extension, that hundreds of products under 133 agreements made at Annecy, France, among 34 nations would be adopted immediately following the extension of the trade agreements.

CURRENCY MANIPULATIONS

The junior Senator from Nevada also said that the currency manipulations would start throughout Europe very soon, following the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

CONSPIRACY TO LOWER WAGES

Mr. President, this amounts to a conspiracy to lower the effective wages of the workmen of this Nation.

Sir Stafford Cripps freezes the wages of the English people but devalues their currency, so the price of commodities goes up, thereby definitely lowering the standard of living.

Mr. Acheson, our Secretary of State, lowers the tariffs on import fees, allowing the products from the low-cost labor to be imported and displaces American-made goods, thereby importing unemployment through importing man-hours of labor of the lower wage and slave labor of the world.

We are knowingly or unknowingly paying the lower wage living standard, and the slave labor of Asia, Europe, and South America against our own high-living-standard working men.

COST OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Mr. President, the devaluation of foreign currencies increased the cost of American exports by 40 percent. The devaluation at the same time decreased the cost of foreign imports to this country by 30 percent.

ANNECY AGREEMENTS BASED ON \$4.03 POUND

The Annecy negotiations and all arguments in favor of the concessions granted by the United States and those obtained for the United States were based on the \$4.03 pound. The great stress placed on the desire to protect American industry against serious injury is also based on the assumption that the imports coming in at the new tariff rate would cost on the basis of \$4.03 for the pound.

All the stress, in the Senate, on the peril-point provision was on the assumption that these peril-points would be determined at the \$4.03 pound.

FEW CONCESSIONS TO UNITED STATES

The much-advertised recent British concessions, eliminating import restrictions, and so forth, apply to everything except United States products; it specifically excludes the application of these liberalized trade restrictions to United States exports.

The State Department propaganda announcing the advantages of the new tariff agreement stressed the advantage to United States exports. It is well known that none of the import quotas, foreign exchange licenses, or other import barriers were removed in favor of United States exports. The reduction in foreign tariffs will, therefore, be completely meaningless for American exporters, and the State Department's claim that benefits will be derived by exporters can only be intentionally deceptive. If the State Department were correct in its claim, then the advantages to American exporters would merely increase the gap between exports and imports and thereby aggravate the so-called dollar shortage.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH SOUTH AMERICA

The implication that new tariff slashing conferences will soon be held with South America, before fluctuating currencies have stabilized, is conclusive proof that the State Department is carrying on its foreign-aid program in contemptuous and reckless disregard of American producers and American labor.

DEVALUATION NULLIFIES TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. President, on September 13 I said that within a short time following the extension of the Trade Agreements Act England would devalue the pound sterling and nullify any trade agreements made with the United States under such agreements since 1934.

We did extend the act, and Great Britain did devalue her currency from \$4.03 to \$2.80, 30½ percent, which action was followed by practically all the European nations.

BRITISH-MADE AUTOS—FORD—TO UNITED STATES

I also said, during the ECA debate, in March of this year, and I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, the following:

Mr. President, the time will come when the jobless auto worker in Detroit will begin asking questions about British-made Ford cars rolling through Grand Central Park, with its owner wearing a suit of clothes made of foreign cloth.

Henry Ford II told workers in his British factory, near London, that his United States dealers will do everything possible to increase sales of English-made Fords in the United States in order to help Britain get dollars.

BRITISH-UNITED NATIONS FOOD AUTHORITY

In Boston, a United Nations food authority warned that unless the United States finds some means of importing more from the rest of the world, United States exports will fall and global depression will set in.

COMPETITIVE VERSUS NONCOMPETITIVE TRADE

Mr. President, it is well known that the 30½-percent reduction caused an immediate reduction of that amount in practically all the goods from England and

other nations sold in this country where they were competitive. Where they were not competitive, as in the case of Scotch whisky and certain other materials which could be sold in any case, instead of allowing the devalue to stand—they raised the amount by 30½ percent, so they could get the same amount of dollars they had always received.

UNITED STATES RECEIVES NO CONCESSIONS

Thereby the United States received no concessions, and the reduction has resulted in a one-way street.

In connection with Mr. Ford's statement that the United States dealers will try to boost the sales of English Fords, I want to submit for the RECORD a clipping from the Wall Street Journal containing an AP dispatch dated yesterday, but appearing in the Wall Street Journal as of today, which says:

LONDON.—Henry Ford II told workers in his British factory his United States dealers will do everything possible to increase sales of English-made Fords in the United States.

Mr. Ford told shop representatives at the Ford plant in nearby Dagenham:

"Your country must get dollars now, and the American Ford Co. and its dealer organization will make every effort to back you up on our side of the Atlantic."

SELL MORE CARS IN UNITED STATES

On our side of the Atlantic. Mr. Ford is "backing them up" in England so they can sell more Fords in this country.

Continuing, he said:

"I give you my word that everything will be done that possibly can be done to increase their (British-made Fords) sales in America."

Last year 3,661 British Fords were sold in the United States, and sales were 4,673 so far this year. The cars, first offered in the United States in May 1948, are the Anglia, a two-door sedan, and the Prefect, a four-door sedan. The sales trend in the United States market has been downward since spring, presumably because of the return of the buyer's market in that country.

CUTS IN UNITED STATES AUTO MANUFACTURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an Associated Press dispatch of this date from Detroit.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAR PRODUCERS BEGIN SEASONAL CUTS IN OUTPUT—STEEL SUPPLY ALSO FACTOR IN TREND OF PRODUCTION

DETROIT, October 10.—The expected production curtailment in the auto industry is under way. Overtime work that figured so largely in the output of records of recent weeks is being cut off. Here and there some smaller factories are cutting back assembly plant schedules.

Last week the industry built 139,609 vehicles. That was a drop of about 5,000 from the previous week. However, the week's effort brought the 1949 production total to date to 5,005,911 units.

Steel, of course, is an immediate concern to the car makers. It would be an even greater worry but for the fact a seasonal drop in production is going to ease the industry's requirements.

The trade paper Automotive News estimates the car builders' steel inventories are sufficient for the assembling of another 600,000 cars and trucks. That's slightly more than a month's output at the current production level.

In their planning, however, the auto manufacturers have to figure on a substantial

volume of material for new model production. Several new models go into production next month.

Among the things you can hear in automotive circles today is that several makes of cars that have been in heavy production recently now are going into storage. That, of course, is what makes up the field stocks now estimated to exceed 600,000 vehicles.

But the important thing about the situation is that it reportedly affects makes that until only a few weeks ago were described as far behind accumulated orders. That, too, is just another seasonal factor that should cut into production totals in the weeks ahead.

There still are a few industry experts talking about a 6,000,000 vehicle output this year. The more conservative among these authorities, however, believe the production cutbacks now in prospect will hold the year's total to not more than 5,800,000.

In the following tabulation Automotive News estimates output by each car maker for the week ended October 8; the week ended October 1, and the period from January 1 through October 8:

	Oct. 8	Oct. 1	Jan. 1- Oct. 8
Chrysler.....	4,514	4,543	118,237
De Soto.....	3,027	3,104	85,821
Dodge.....	9,076	9,166	235,002
Plymouth.....	14,511	14,493	443,243
Total, Chrysler.....	31,128	31,306	882,303
Ford.....	20,393	20,536	647,418
Lincoln.....	926	933	29,501
Mercury.....	4,614	4,611	155,618
Total, Ford.....	25,933	26,080	832,537
Buick.....	8,405	8,720	320,494
Cadillac.....	1,960	1,914	69,634
Chevrolet.....	26,738	26,697	887,220
Oldsmobile.....	5,875	6,994	231,915
Pontiac.....	6,848	8,928	268,804
Total, General Motors.....	49,826	53,253	1,778,067
Frazer.....			6,460
Kaiser.....	1,241		48,513
Total, Kaiser-Frazer.....	1,241		54,973
Crosley.....	100	56	7,534
Hudson.....		1,709	116,453
Nash.....	3,544	3,945	113,029
Packard.....	1,888	3,607	91,524
Studebaker.....	5,295	5,204	171,777
Willys.....	808		26,347
Total cars, United States.....	119,763	125,160	4,074,544
Total trucks, United States.....	19,846	19,442	931,367
Total cars and trucks, United States.....	139,609	144,602	5,005,911
Total cars and trucks, Canada.....	6,912	6,866	229,677
Total cars and trucks, United States and Canada.....	146,521	151,468	5,235,588

In its survey of truck output Automotive News credits Chevrolet with building 7,112 last week against 7,332 in the preceding week; Dodge 2,721 against 2,747; Ford, 5,488 against 6,050; GMC, 1,427 against 1,329; International, 299 against 139; Studebaker, 1,072 against 1,036; and Willys, 870 against none.

AMERICAN WORKINGMEN THROWN INTO COMPETITION WITH LOW-WAGE LABOR OF WORLD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, wittingly or unwittingly we are throwing the slave labor and the low-wage labor of the world into direct competition with American labor. Without any disparaging remarks of Mr. Ford, for whom I have the highest regard, we are going to the point-4 program, the bold, new program.

AMERICAN VERSUS EUROPEAN MARKETS

We shall not only furnish the market that was supposed to be made available—at least, it was the conclusion reached a year ago last March, when the Marshall plan was being considered, that we were going to develop a great market throughout the world for American products, American labor, and American investments—but we are going to guarantee the investments of American businessmen such as Mr. Ford and Mr. Rand, of Remington Rand, and the businessmen of other nations.

They have been encouraged to go to the low-wage countries, and not only are they securing the markets which were supposed to be made available to American businessmen and workmen, but through free trade, they are bringing products into this country which are in direct competition.

SIR HERBERT BROADLEY—AMERICAN MARKETS

Mr. President, I should like to submit for the RECORD a rather lengthy statement of five points made by Sir Herbert Broadley, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. Mr. Broadley says that the reduction of trade restrictions which would make it difficult for foreign nations to find a market in the United States is a matter which should be further pursued in order to have world prosperity; in other words, that there should be a greater access to the American market and a greater investment in Europe and in other parts of the world.

Higher productive efficiency in Europe in order to supply the United States market and meet competition—"temporary sacrifices for future gains"—

Is necessary. He further said:

Big capital investment in undeveloped countries, mostly on the part of the United States—maybe as much as \$10,000,000,000 annually.

It should be very interesting to Senators that \$10,000,000,000 annually is necessary, at least in the opinion of this expert from England, Sir Herbert Broadley, for world prosperity.

I read further:

In this connection Sir Herbert declared President Truman's "point 4" for technical and economic assistance is "undoubtedly the remedy, outstanding beyond all others, for solving our current problem."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point the Associated Press dispatch from Boston, dated October 10, from which I have just been quoting.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, October 10.—Unless the United States finds some means of importing more from the rest of the world, a United Nations Food Authority said today, its exports will fall and global depression will set in.

Five major remedies were proposed by Sir Herbert Broadley, Deputy Director-General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

FEARS POLITICAL BLOC

He told the annual Boston conference on distribution that unless these are carried out

the world will shape up into two (or three) self-contained groups and the threat of surpluses (of all kinds) in the dollar world will soon become a menacing social and political problem.

He listed the remedies as—

1. Maintaining high production and employment, especially in the United States.
2. The reduction of trade restrictions which make it difficult for other countries to find a market in the United States.

PRODUCTIVITY RISE NEEDED

3. Higher productive efficiency in Europe in order to supply the United States market and meet competition—"temporary sacrifices for future gains."

4. Big capital investment in undeveloped countries, mostly on the part of the United States—maybe as much as \$10,000,000,000 annually.

In this connection, Sir Herbert declared President Truman's point 4 for technical and economic assistance is "undoubtedly the remedy, outstanding beyond all others, for solving our current problem."

MULTILATERAL TRADE

5. "Trade must ultimately become multi-lateral and currencies freely convertible again." Britain's recent devaluation of the pound sterling, Sir Herbert said, was an "essential first step" in this direction.

A device to tide the world over until these remedies become effective, he declared, is the FAO's recently proposed International Commodity Clearing House.

The short-run function of this body, he explained, would be to acquire with its member-contributed capital surpluses occurring in member countries.

PAYMENT FOR STOCK

This stock would then be resold to other members. They would pay for it either with their own money or with low rates in a currency acceptable to the supplying country.

And in the long run, Sir Herbert said, the IOCH would direct its activities toward stabilizing prices and production.

This proposed body, he concluded, offers to the United States "an international rather than a national solution of its economic problems—a matter of utmost importance to this country because of its creditor position and because its responsibilities for leadership are, under present world conditions, unique."

DOUBTS EARLY REVIVAL

At the opening session of the two-day conference, A. W. Zelomek, president of the International Statistical Bureau, Inc., said he doubted that in the near future "we are quite ready for a broad and vigorous revival of business activity."

But "there is still a large volume of accumulated demand," he declared, in a prepared text, and a field of technological improvement which "will make cost problems look less desperate than they now appear."

Vice Adm. E. D. Foster, chairman of the Munitions Board's distribution policy council, said in another speech that in any future war the United States would be operating in an "economy of scarcity."

SEES TERMINAL POINT

"Such a situation is historic with the nations of Europe and of Asia, but a new development for the United States. There is a terminal point, proved by the last war, beyond which greater demand will result only in negligible output."

The industrial East is facing a new rival in the Pacific Coast States and may lose old markets if it doesn't get on the ball, said Nathaniel H. Engle, professor of business administration at the University of Washington.

Not only are the States of California, Oregon, and Washington depending less and less upon the East for manufactured goods, he said, but they are invading it increasingly with merchandise and branch plants.

This trend is being aided, Professor Engle declared, because national distributors have failed to evaluate fully recent changes in Western population and income and consequently "have been slow to make necessary adjustments in quotas."

TARIFF REDUCTIONS AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the results of the recent tariff reductions, as announced by the State Department, are in direct conflict with farm price supports as contemplated by Congress. Quoting from the New York Journal of Commerce:

The largest items affected by tariff cuts, as measured by the volume of imports last year, were almost all agricultural.

The list of reductions include tariff cuts on black strap molasses, which competes with our grains in the production of alcohol, canned meats, hides and butter—all products of our livestock industry. How can we keep faith with agriculture when on one hand we pass legislation to support farm prices and on the other hand permit tariff reductions on farm products to force the price down. It seems to me that we are running around in a vicious circle that will ultimately force down our farm price structure and force the United States into a depression.

From time to time I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate that we were being led into a vast program which will ultimately become a "share the wealth" program under a program of international socialism.

FREE TRADE AND POINT 4

Under the program of free trade, Sir Broadley's program will be forced upon us. We will buy up the food supplies of the world in excess of a mere existence diet for other nations. We will furnish the funds through ECA to buy up the supplies of other nations for distribution in Europe while we store ours with commodity loans. In that way the United States will become the international clearing house that Sir Broadley mentions. We will furnish all the capital in this operation.

In addition, Sir Broadley expects us to spend \$10,000,000,000 a year to develop other nations, so that we can pile up more supplies produced in a world that believes in low prices and low wages.

With our national debt of \$255,000,000,000 every Member of this Senate must realize that we must maintain a high price level if we are to have the national income to meet our obligations. If we are to continue to have full employment it is imperative that agricultural prices be supported at a parity level.

COST LEVEL PRICE AND TARIFF

In my opinion it is impossible to have a successful support-price program for agriculture or the wages of American labor unless we have tariff protection at the American cost level. The United Nations, the New Deal, and the Fair Deal all added together are not powerful enough to bypass arithmetic. If we are

sincere in offering a price-support program for agriculture, then we must demand that this support price be protected at the same level against the imports from nations that believe in low wage standards.

We cannot go in two different directions at the same time. We are either going to maintain our American price level and have a national income for prosperity, or we are going to permit cheap imports to destroy our price level and force us into national bankruptcy. The recent tariff reductions are just another step toward the financial collapse of our American system.

TARIFFS AND STEEL PRODUCTION

Mr. President, I have outlined the effects of a new wave of tariff cuts on certain products, with special reference to steel, and I ask unanimous consent to have the statement included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECTS OF NEW WAVE OF TARIFF CUTS

The United States has just announced tariff cuts negotiated with 10 countries: Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Liberia, Nicaragua, Sweden, and Uruguay.

The tariff reductions apply to exported commodities to the 10 countries from the United States which totaled \$537,000,000 in 1947.

The concessions granted by the United States consisted of tariff cuts as high as 50 percent on dozens of commodities, including such important products as butter, steel, cheese, olive oil, plywood, molasses, and various steel products. The drastic reductions in tariffs on steel and steel products are likely to have important adverse effects on employment in the American steel industry, and accentuate the decline in employment which has been growing rapidly during the past year.

TARIFF REDUCTIONS WILL HURT AMERICAN STEEL INDUSTRY

Under the Ancey agreements American tariffs on steel ingots, wire rods, iron and steel bars, strips, plates, and sheets of steel and iron, steel wire, and forgings of iron or steel were in each instance cut by 50 percent. This will greatly encourage steel imports into the United States at the very time when we have surplus steel capacity here and employment in the steel industry has fallen off by 135,000 since July of last year. The number of production workers in the American steel industry declined from 1,068,000 in July 1948 to only 933,000 in July of 1949.

The State Department points out that imports of steel were small from Sweden and other countries last year, but the size of steel imports in 1948 has nothing whatever to do with what steel imports will be in the future under the greatly reduced tariffs and with Europe now back into production and with surplus steel capacity. The countries of western Europe today are producing far more steel than they did just prior to World War II. Let us look at some of the figures:

Sweden: In 1938 Sweden produced 996,000 tons of steel ingots and castings. In 1949 Sweden is producing at the rate of 1,380,000 tons annually.

France: In 1938 France produced 6,200,000 tons of steel. In 1949 France was producing at the rate of 9,600,000 tons annually.

Luxemburg: In 1938 Luxemburg produced 1,400,000 tons of steel. In 1949 Luxemburg is producing at the rate of 2,800,000 tons annually, or double the prewar rate.

England: England is producing steel at almost double the 1938 prewar rate. In 1938 England produced 10,500,000 tons of steel. During the second quarter of 1949 England was producing steel at the rate of 16,000,000 tons annually.

With the exception of western Germany the countries of western Europe today are producing far more steel than in 1938 and are now having difficulty in selling it all. They look to the United States as the place to dump their surplus steel, which will be possible now that tariffs have been cut 50 percent.

And the countries of western Europe not only are producing more steel than they can sell but they are planning to still further increase their steel capacity with funds given by the United States under ECA. Paul Hoffman testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee in June that he wanted to give these European countries over \$300,000,000 to increase their steel capacity. France, Scotland, and Italy are countries scheduled to receive millions to increase their steel capacities.

SWEDEN PLANS TO INVADE THE AMERICAN MARKET

According to the country study on Sweden prepared by the ECA, it is evident that Sweden plans to greatly increase her exports to the United States during the next 3 years while holding her imports from the United States to a minimum. On page 80 of this study it is stated that Sweden plans to increase her exports to North America by 33 percent above 1947. She plans to increase her exports of iron and steel by 1952 to 80 percent above the 1947 level. Meanwhile she hopes to decrease her imports from the United States.

A look at the concessions which Sweden granted United States imports into her country indicates that the concessions are practically worthless, as they are on products which Sweden produces not at all or in deficient supply, so must import them whether tariffs are high or low. For example, Sweden cut tariffs by 5 percent only on American automobiles. But Sweden produces no autos similar to United States cars, so these concessions will have no effect in increasing exports of American automobiles to Sweden.

A further examination of the concessions granted to the United States by Sweden shows that in practically every instance Sweden merely agreed not to raise tariffs but to keep them where they are; while the United States, on the other hand, slashed its tariffs by 50 percent. Moreover, Sweden's tariffs are low anyway, and the promise to keep them unchanged is certainly not a 50-50 square deal when we cut our tariffs by 50 percent. The tariff agreement with Sweden is a striking example that the agreement is a one-way street and can in no sense of the word be considered a reciprocal trade agreement. Sweden wins everything and the United States wins nothing.

And it should be remembered that the 50-percent slash in tariffs on steel and steel products applies to all other countries besides Sweden. British steel, Belgian steel, French steel, etc., can now flood the American market and increase the unemployment in our American steel industry.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to recall to my colleagues that in March of this year, in my debate on the subject of the ECA, I quoted an article written by Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of the ECA, which appeared in the April issue of the American magazine. The following was one of the quotations:

Secondly, we must go out of our way consciously to encourage imports from Europe. We must, in certain instances, be ready to reduce tariffs to make it possible for them to trade with us. The Danes, for example,

would like to send us more of their good butter in exchange for United States goods; but an inordinate tariff of 14 cents a pound prevents them from doing so.

Senators will note that it says "an inordinate tariff." This must have been in some way a prediction of the future. The tariff is no longer 14 cents. It is 7 cents, as it was listed today in the reduction notice.

Now just another paragraph from this April number of the American magazine, quoting from Mr. Paul Hoffman:

Another way Europeans can increase their sales to us is by letting us see exactly what they do offer. Perhaps a "fair train" touring the country with displays of European merchandise and taking orders from wholesalers and department stores would help.

THE DIRECTOR OF ECA

I am quoting, not from someone in Sweden, or other European countries, or South Africa, who want to sell things in this country, I am quoting from the Director of the great organization which the Senate of the United States built up in order to develop a great market throughout the world for United States businessmen. The predictions made in this April number of the American magazine have proved very true. It must have been written in February. The Annecy, France, conference was in session from April to August 1949. Many of the cuts which were then predicted were announced.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to cite the various examples in this preliminary analysis of protocol of the general agreement on tariffs and trade, negotiated at Annecy, France, April-August 1949. I call attention to the fact that the article in the American magazine was written before the session where they cut tariffs on articles like butter, which Mr. Paul Hoffman indicated should be done.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

I wish to read very briefly from page 105 of this analysis. It is so full of such comparisons that just reading briefly from such an agreement should be sufficient to make the Senate back away from anything that has been done so far in these conferences. Unfortunately, the Senate does not have to ratify these treaties.

On page 105 there under the heading "Concessions obtained from Sweden," let us see what these concessions are. We gave plenty of concessions to Sweden. All the concessions we made, which are set forth in this book, are available to Sweden and every other country under the multilateral treaty arrangement. I quote:

AN EXAMPLE OF SWEDISH CONCESSIONS

The rates applied under the Swedish tariff are generally moderate, and most of the concessions to the United States are bindings of present rates or of duty-free treatment. In many concessions involving specific rates of duty, Sweden has reserved the right to convert specific rates to ad valorem rates at levels no higher than those indicated for the respective items.

In other words, most of the concessions to the United States are bindings of present rates, and also they have made

the great concession that the specific duties will be changed into ad valorem duties, of the same effect, however.

I read further:

If established, these rates will be, in general, about equal to or lower than the ad valorem equivalents of the present rates during 1936-38.

TRADES A ONE-WAY STREET

Mr. President, finally I want to say again that most of these great concessions and trades represent a one-way street. They do so for many reasons.

MANIPULATION OF CURRENCY

The main reason, however, is the manipulation of the currency. All of these great trade treaties made from 1934 to the present day, and including the Annecy, France, agreements were made on the basis of \$4.03 for the pound, along with other European currencies on that general basis; then comes a reduction of 30½ percent, which nullifies at one time all the agreements that have been made under these trade agreements.

METHODS OF MANIPULATING MONEY EXCHANGE

Mr. President, the devaluation of the currency is just one of the follow-ups; Britain still retains control, and the situation still is manipulated. The pound still has many different values depending on where one is going to spend it.

For example, no one with whom I am acquainted has ever paid \$2.80 for a pound.

With respect to trading in the Far East I will give the Senate one specific example. Many of them can be given. Before the devaluation a United States dollar bought \$6.10 of Hong Kong money. Fifteen dollars of Hong Kong money bought a pound sterling. That is \$2.60. So the first devaluation did not come down to the true level.

THE DOLLAR STANDARD

I would say in passing, while I am on the subject, that there is only one thing that would ever make trade flow between the two countries, and that would be a freely convertible currency; that is, freely convertible European currencies and all other currencies, in terms of the dollar. We have no gold standard, but we would then have a dollar standard, instead of there being so much complaint about a dollar shortage.

NO DOLLAR TROUBLE

Of course, there is no dollar shortage, and there is no dollar trouble, and there is no pound sterling trouble and there is no franc trouble and there is no guilder trouble that a little simple honesty would not cure.

TRUE VALUE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

In other words, let the currencies reach their true values on the markets of the world and one would just as soon have a pound sterling in his pocket as \$2.60, if that is what the pound costs on the markets of New York or London.

No one, however, wants to get caught with very many pounds in his pocket which cost \$4.03, or which cost even \$2.80. That, Mr. President, is what is holding up trade.

SPEND OWN MONEY IN UNITED STATES

If there were freely convertible currencies foreigners could spend their own money in the United States. They do not need the dollars. That is merely a fallacy. Then beyond that there are put into effect the quotas and the embargoes and the license fees and the specifications.

EXCHANGE CONTROLS RETARD TRADE

With respect to exchange controls, like that of the pound, one cannot spend the pound anywhere in any area in Europe except where the Bank of England says one can spend it. Therefore trade is restricted. Such a situation as that is what holds up trade. It will continue to hold up trade.

FEW CONCESSIONS MADE TO UNITED STATES

Mr. President, the advertising and the statements and editorials published in the United States newspapers today on foreign concessions made to the United States are wide of the truth. Britain has made very few if any concessions to us. Even if she agrees to lower a tariff what good would that be if quotas keep us out, or if the exchanges keep us out, or if specifications keep us out, as they do in Bermuda, for example, and in many other places? England sets the specifications there of an automobile. It cannot weigh more than a certain number of pounds, and just by coincidence England is the only country which makes an automobile of that certain weight. The same is true with respect to other products. So the United States is unable to trade.

Mr. President, I will say in closing that the European countries have had from 100 to 300 years of experience in foreign trade, while we are just neophytes. Our initiation fees are coming very high in financial and economic matters.

CONGRESS SHOULD ADOPT FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE PRINCIPLE

Congress should repeal the Trade Agreements Act of 1949 and adopt the flexible import fee principle of again protecting the American workingmen and American investments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I had agreed that the Senate would take a recess at 7 o'clock. We have not completed action on the farm bill and it is apparent we cannot do so tonight. Three or four more amendments are still to be acted upon.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I want to take only a moment of the Senate's time to observe that today, October 11, is the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

General Pulaski was one of the great figures in the history of man's struggle for liberty. At the age of 20 he joined in the revolt against the foreign domination of Poland by Stanislaus II. When he was forced to flee from Poland

he joined forces in Turkey's fight against Russian domination.

Again defeated in Turkey, Pulaski came to America, where he was welcomed and served valiantly in the American struggle for independence. He fell mortally wounded at the siege of Savannah.

General Pulaski left his stamp on America. It is the stamp of an unrelenting quest for freedom which joins all nations and all people.

It is appropriate that we should be observing the anniversary of General Pulaski's death and the contribution which he made to the American heritage. The country of his birth is today overrun by a tyranny of the sort he fought against. The menace to liberty is everywhere throughout the world.

But the heritage of which General Pulaski was so great a part stands out as our people's great bulwark against such threats.

LOBBYING ACTIVITIES IN CONNECTION WITH DISPLACED PERSONS LEGISLATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have been shocked by the fact that in order to get one bill passed in the Senate one organization has spent nearly \$1,000,000, and has so reported under oath. We do not know how much more they have spent. Therefore I submit a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed and lie on the table. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it appears from reports filed in accordance with the Regulation of Lobbying Act that large sums of money have been expended by the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons and other organizations and person or persons for the purpose of influencing the passage of legislation relating to displaced persons;

Whereas it is advisable to ascertain why the expenditure of nearly a million dollars was necessary for such purposes, and whether any of such expenditures were made for illegal purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, composed of three members to be appointed by the chairman thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to lobbying activities in connection with displaced persons legislation with a view to ascertaining the reasons for the expenditure of excessive amounts of money for such purposes and whether any of such expenditures were made for illegal purposes and whether other money was spent which has not been legally reported.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem necessary.

The resolution (S. Res. 186) was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I might say that I was actuated to submit this resolution by resolutions adopted by the American Legion and by other veterans' organizations at their annual conventions.

VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER NEHRU TO AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon it had been my hope that I might be able to say a few words with reference to a very momentous event which has taken place today. I

refer to the visit of the distinguished leader of south Asia, one of the great statesmen of our time, the Premier of India, Mr. Nehru. As Senators know, the President of the United States afforded the Prime Minister of India the opportunity and the privilege of using the President's plane in a flight from London to the National Airport at Washington, D. C. It is my understanding that the President and members of the Cabinet greeted Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister, upon his first official visit to the United States of America.

This afternoon I listened with much interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and I have listened on other occasions to the remarks of my colleagues pertaining to the problems of foreign policy in the Far Eastern area. I would say that the visit of Mr. Nehru marks a turning point in American foreign policy in reference to the Far East and in particular in reference to south Asia.

On many occasions I have had the opportunity of studying material pertaining to this section of the world, and it has been my observation that there has been far too little consideration given to this great country of 333,000,000 people. It represents a great force for liberty and democracy in the eastern section of the world, or in the Asiatic area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* at the end of my remarks a special feature article published in the *New York Times Magazine* of last Sunday, October 9, 1949. The article is entitled "Spokesman of a Troubled Continent. Prime Minister Nehru, a Hero to the Millions of India, Is Also the Champion of the New Asia."

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* at the end of my remarks an editorial from the *Washington Post* of October 11, 1949, entitled "Welcome to Nehru."

The *PRESIDENT* pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion concerning American foreign policy, particularly as it pertains to the mainland of Asia and the East Indies.

Recent events in China have brought into sharp focus the complexity of the problem of a policy in Asiatic areas as well as failure of our Nation to have any consistent foreign policy in Asia.

Repeatedly, competent observers of international events have warned our Nation of the importance of developing a sound and consistent foreign policy pertaining to the nations in the Asiatic area. Recent events in Burma, French Indo-China, Indonesia, China, and India compel our Government to direct its attention to these troubled and explosive regions. The cold war in Europe has diverted our attention to the European theater despite the fact that we consistently talk in terms of one world.

Surely, the memory of Japanese aggression, Chinese civil war, and the freedom of India should remind us that Asia cannot be ignored. Then, too, the diplomatic and moral problem with which we are faced in Indonesia and our relationships with the Dutch Government

call to mind the difficulties that we face in formulating a consistent world-wide policy that conforms with our ideals and our position of world leadership.

Frankly, we need friends in Asia. We need to bolster up those forces that are aspiring to democratic goals. We need to recognize the tremendous potential of wealth and power as well as the real fact of population and race that exist in the Asiatic area. What to do in China is a question mark and will remain so for some time to come. The other potential great power in Asia is India. This nation is still preserving its freedom. India still remains free from Communist conquest or successful infiltration. India is blessed by the leadership of a humanitarian and a man of democratic instincts, Pandit Nehru.

India is strategically located for purposes of geopolitics. In other words, geographically she is a pivotal nation in our relationships with the Near East and the Far East. She represents a great potential industrially and commercially. She is a republic with a constitution that points in the direction of individual freedom and responsible government. She is a leader in the southeastern Asia area. The recent conference of southeastern Asiatic states called by Pandit Nehru is ample testimony as to her strategic and vital role in Asiatic affairs.

Likewise, India is a member in good standing of the United Nations. She has played a consistent and devoted role to the principles of the United Nations Charter. Up to this time, she has aligned herself in the United Nations deliberations on the side of the Western Powers. She has a deep friendship for the United States.

We in the United States have watched with sympathy, affection, and understanding, India's long struggle for independence and we welcomed her with cordiality when, her immediate objective reached, she joined the family of independent nations 2 years ago.

The imagination of the American people had been captured by that struggle and by the strength and high purpose of Gandhi's leadership. Since Gandhi's tragic death, which so shocked and grieved the whole world, our eyes have been focused on the most highly esteemed of his disciples, the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru, who is guiding the great Indian people through these difficult, early days of their newly regained freedom.

There already exist many bonds which bind us in friendship to India. The traditional love of freedom and democracy held by the Indian people strikes a similar chord in us. We likewise believe that this democratic freedom can flourish only in a world at peace, a world in which the fruits of the earth and of man's ingenuity are freely carried to all peoples.

Like India, we believe that a free democratic political system exists for the benefit of its citizens. These ties between India and the United States now exist. It is now our pleasant duty to work for their strengthening.

In recent weeks events have helped to focus our eyes primarily on Europe. In Asia we have all been concerned and

puzzled by the enigma of China—no such puzzling situation obtains in India. She is a great and rich country, a nation which fought beside us in the Second World War, and which has associated itself in the cause of peace since the war. India is a nation of ever-increasing democracy, whose leaders today are among the great and wise men of our times. Her government, under such leadership, is emerging as a politically and economically stable administration, despite the tremendous difficulties imposed by partition of the subcontinent and by the economic dislocations which India shares with most of the rest of the world. It is in India and the rest of southeast Asia that the real struggle for men's minds is now taking place.

There, newly enfranchised peoples will soon be able for the first time in modern history to go to the polls and determine the sort of government which will administer their countries. Many of these people are illiterate. Their knowledge of the democratic system is composed solely of a fundamental, instinctive love for freedom. The problems of these governments in education and in the maintenance of a standard of living above starvation level, are therefore enormous. And there is the ever-present danger that totalitarianism, in one form or another, may step in where men and women lack the necessities of decent living.

In the south Asian area we recognize India as an essential element in the maintenance of political and economic stability. Without stability in south Asia it is no exaggeration to say that there can be no real peace in the world. It is in our interests, therefore, in the cause of that peace which the American people so desire, to work in effective collaboration with the people and the Government of India.

The subcontinent has been the source of many great and ancient civilizations. We are now happy to be associated with a new India as she resumes her place in world affairs. I know that, working closely with other like-minded nations, she can be a powerful factor in our efforts to attain that common purpose.

Yes, I repeat, in South Asia we recognize India as an essential element in the maintenance of political and economic stability in that area. Without stability in Southern Asia, without freedom for Asiatics, without education for the people of Asia, without food and nourishment for the children of Asia—there can be no real peace in the world.

India is not a question mark. In every way she belongs to the family of free nations. Her needs are no secret; they are all too evident. Her aspirations are not hidden; her ideals are not camouflaged.

With these needs, aspirations, and ideals in mind, our task here in the United States is clear if we would help build a free world.

First, we must recognize the needs of India as being equally crucial as those of Europe. With this in mind, we must understand that vast numbers of her peoples are poverty-stricken and uneducated, that India's national economy is only \$13,636,300,000 for her 337,000,000

people as compared to our approximately \$224,000,000,000 in 1948 for our 140,000,000 people. Her per capita income therefore is about one-fortieth of ours. It would be in the best interest of world peace and world order for America to extend direct financial assistance to India under the same terms as our Marshall-plan program for Europe.

To be sure, India can and will use the facilities of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. These are the facilities which have been made available in this postwar period for the relief and rehabilitation of peoples who are recovering from the ravages of war and who are attempting to develop and improve their economies. Yes, these facilities are not only available but it is to the interest of all nations that they be effectively utilized. This, however, does not minimize our opportunity for direct assistance through grants and loans under terms similar to the ECA to our friend, the Republic of India.

Secondly, we must recognize the legitimate self-government aspirations of the countries of southeast Asia and avoid aid or comfort or encouragement to any European nation now attempting to maintain an old, antiquated colonial system by continuing to subjugate the peoples of southeastern Asia.

Thirdly, we must recognize that there are many areas in which our two countries can cooperate to our mutual benefit in the development of commerce and industrial techniques in the advances which are obtained from scientific progress.

India needs help to bring her riches out of the ground, to extend her industrial production, to feed her expanding economy. India needs our support in that venture quickly and adequately. In 1947-48 India reclaimed 32,306 acres of land for agriculture. She is now working to reclaim 100,000 acres more. Her industrial production is increasing. She is now producing electrical supplies, Diesel engines, bicycles, superphosphates, caustic sodas, soda ash, sugar, hydrogenated oils, and soaps at a new high peak. We must help her.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an excerpt from a column by Stewart Alsop in the New York Herald Tribune of August 5, 1949. I read what Mr. Alsop had to say:

Yet the fact remains that India has a government which governs and that India is the last best hope of Asia. There are two phrases which the reporter in India hears constantly repeated: "About 5 years will tell the story," and "It all depends on food."

Find the food, within that time, to feed India's people a little above the level of half-starved animals, and India will become a vital makeweight against the Kremlin's Asiatic imperialism. Fail, and India is ultimately lost, and so is Asia.

The Indian Government prodded by Premier Jawaharlal Nehru, is now making a determined effort to solve the food problem, which is at the heart of all India's problems. Nothing in all Asia is more inescapably obvious than that it is in the American interest that this effort should succeed. And with surplus wheat piling up in the American granaries, it is nonsense to say, as some say here, that the Indian problem is too vast

for American help, and that nothing can be done here by the United States.

I also ask to have incorporated in the RECORD an excerpt from Mr. Alsop's column of August 22, 1949, in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The odd sense of unreality which most travelers experience on their return from abroad is curiously heightened in one who has returned to Washington from the Far East. For it is perfectly clear that, if southeast Asia is allowed to go the way of China, an unthinkable war is virtually inevitable. And it is perfectly clear that southeast Asia will go the way of China—and very soon—unless a major effort is made to reverse the process which is now under way.

Yet—and this causes the sense of unreality—there is no atmosphere of urgency at all in Washington. There is a good deal of talk. There is a good deal of worrying. A good many policy papers are being written. But nothing very much is being done, and nobody seems to contemplate doing anything very much for a long time to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the pamphlet entitled "India," published August 15, 1949, by the Embassy of India, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps the greatest handicap facing the Government of India is the shortage of food and the necessity to spend hard-earned foreign exchange on imports of food-grains. The Government of India has declared war on food scarcity and a tremendous drive is in progress to make India self-sufficient in food by 1951.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that excerpt to be printed in the body of the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the body of the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the pamphlet long?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I have merely asked to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt of five lines from a pamphlet which was published by the Indian Embassy.

American private capital will find a welcome market in India. The Government of that nation has indicated its friendly attitude toward private investment and industrial development. In view of the great potentialities for a mass market and the possibilities of development of the natural resources of India, it should be expected that American private capital will flow to India in ever-increasing amounts. We must remember, however, that the days of capital exploitation or of economic imperialism are over. Capital has a moral obligation to serve the people and not to exploit them. Private capital has every right to expect a reasonable profit. It also has an obligation to be reasonable in its relationships with the people and the government.

Fourthly, we must strengthen the ties that bind us and I suggest that we give

serious consideration to the formulation of a program for educational opportunities and advancements, and in which Indian students are given an opportunity to make use of the educational facilities and opportunities in our country on the basis of scholarships provided by our Government. In turn, it is important that we encourage American students to go to India so that we may know each other and grow to respect one another.

Finally, we must recognize that America must redeem itself in the eyes of the people of India, and must earn for itself again the position of world moral leadership. The birth of a new India should lead us here to rededicate ourselves to the principles of human equality which gave the early sustenance to our new Nation. We must remember that we were the Nation which gave to the world the political ideal that all men are equal, that men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that all men have these rights. To do that, it is altogether fitting and proper that we forcefully demonstrate again our belief in these principles by acting to insure a climate and an atmosphere in our society which would allow our brethren and fellow citizens of whatever color, race, creed, or national origin to walk again with heads raised high and with dignity.

The future of the world lies across the Pacific. Let us not allow that future to escape us. Let us understand that fact; let us understand that the Asiatic peoples are rising to greatness and strength. Let us understand that they wish to be our friends; that they can be our friends; and that they will be our friends if we welcome them as friends. Let us act like friends. Let us act toward them like fellow citizens in one world. Let us help them in their struggles for stability, for maintenance and sustenance. Let us in our attitude toward them and in our demonstration of that attitude, through our laws—including our immigration laws—prove the sincerity of our convictions.

The interests of the United States and India are interdependent. Together we can help build a world order and a world society based on freedom and democracy.

It is in this spirit that we welcome the Prime Minister of India. We regard his presence in our country as further evidence of our friendship and interdependence.

Mr. President, as we view the visit of this great international figure a new hope ought to come into our hearts. I have heard a great deal of disappointed talk, and at times almost irresponsible talk, with respect to our foreign policy. I think it can be frankly said that we have not developed a foreign policy with respect to these 330,000,000 people. I think it is time for the United States to develop such a foreign policy.

I for one, as a younger member of the Government, am not going to constantly look backward to our mistakes. I think it is time for us to look forward to a better future. It seems to me that our relations with this great nation, which is so strategically located, may well spell the difference between peace and war. It is in the philosophy of those remarks that I welcome the visit of the great

Prime Minister of India. I hope that his visit to the United States will convince him that this Nation is a nation of peace-loving people, that we are desirous of being of help to the millions of India, and that we look forward to a friendly and sound commercial and diplomatic relationship between the United States and the great Dominion of India.

It seems to me that there is a market for our goods; but more than that, there is a place in the world in which we find a friendly leader, where we will find a friendly neighbor and a spirit of understanding as to our mutual needs and mutual problems.

EXHIBIT A

[From This Week magazine of October 9, 1949]

SPOKESMAN OF A TROUBLED CONTINENT—PRIME MINISTER NEHRU, A HERO TO THE MILLIONS OF INDIA, IS ALSO THE CHAMPION OF THE NEW ASIA

(By Robert Trumbull)

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, arrives in the United States this week and the American public will see for the first time the world's most popular individual—if a man's popularity can be measured by the spontaneous response of his countrymen. Crowds of a million and more in moderate-sized cities of India are no novelty for him.

In any comparison of the appeal of national leaders among their own peoples, Nehru enters the competition with the advantage of heading the world's most populous united country. India contains almost one-sixth of the population of the globe. Most of this mass—at least most of those with an awareness of personalities beyond the stultifying life of their own mud villages—idolize Jawaharlal Nehru. The Prime Minister has not applied himself to the technique of mass appeal and never has sought this vast popularity. Indeed, he has very little in common with the masses that cheer him and he often is violently impatient with their vagaries. In writings he has appraised his stature as a national hero with good-humored cynicism but he is humanly appreciative of it and uses it in a calculated way. Only the late Mohandas Gandhi, an uncanny psychologist where Indian temperament was concerned, possessed greater public appeal.

Nehru, however, did not learn from Gandhi how to win his people. The Prime Minister is a far different personality from his mentor and though Gandhi's mantle fell upon Nehru this did not increase his actual standing; he already had it. Nor did it make him in any sense a new Mahatma (Great Soul). He remained Gandhi's protégé and temporal successor but not his spiritual heir or equal.

The beliefs of Gandhi—in their broadest sense and not applied to particular things—vastly influence Nehru and India but Nehru's appeal to his people and his kind of leadership are his own brand. He is perhaps a bridge between today's world and Gandhi's world, which was not of today but of yesterday and tomorrow. For Nehru is the synthesis of the east and west, of Gandhi's ancient India and the halls of Lake Success.

Gandhi and Nehru were worlds apart in personality and outlook and Nehru often doubted and disagreed and was uncertain in his mind. But he understood the basic rightness of his great leader's approach—rereading Indian history of the past 30 years one can see that Gandhi's course almost always turned out to be the right one—and he had the profoundest respect for Gandhi's depth of perception into the Indian mind.

Nehru follows the Gandhian path, broadly speaking, today. But in his own way. He makes many compromises between Gandhi's ethereal philosophy and the realities of life

in India. The Gandhian doctrine of non-violence guides Nehru's conduct of India's foreign affairs but he is too much of a realist to go along with Gandhi in advocating the abolition of armies, navies, and police forces. This is an ideal the achievement of which Nehru does not foresee in his own time.

During the war, Nehru considered Gandhi's advice against armed resistance to Germany and Japan absurd. Today he would not hesitate to lead India into a shooting war, if such an extremity faced him, to gain what he thought was right or to resist what he thought was evil. He has, in fact, allowed Indian armed forces to move four times in less than 2 years of independence in order to preserve what he considered this country's security. These were all minor affairs having to do with princely states but they indicate the extent of Nehru's compromise with non-violence.

Nehru is Gandhian in his meticulously fair treatment of minorities, a policy that cost Gandhi his life and has made Nehru many enemies among the religious extremists of this country. He is Gandhian again in his holding India aloof from the cold struggle between the Soviet bloc and Western democracies.

Nehru is accused of trying to keep in right with both sides. It is fairer to say he is following what he thinks is the right course—the path toward ultimate world justice and peace—convinced that Gandhi's way must eventually come to universal acceptance and that India thereby will gain respect and greatness in world councils.

Nehru today is thoroughly the product of his own background in which contact with Gandhi was important but perhaps not the most important part. Nehru's early upbringing was amid surroundings of Western culture and luxury—his father was a wealthy lawyer and his tutors were English. He emerged from his education at Harrow and Cambridge far more European than Indian in his tastes and ways and he was not, in a strict sense of the word, a Hindu at all.

Descended from Kashmiri Brahmins—his title Pandit or Learned One is extended to all men of this exalted caste—he professed agnosticism, and his autobiography reveals complete impatience with those trappings of Hinduism which he thinks have held his people back. Of course, it would have been impossible for him to escape some of the sensitiveness and embedded gloom characteristic of his race. But his reflectiveness and introspection are perhaps not inherent qualities but products of his long periods of reading and contemplation while in British prisons.

He has an immense pride in India's ancient heritage, its ageless culture and thought. In his earlier years his interest in his country extended to lands nearby and he interprets history in the light of its impingements upon Asia. Inevitably he looks upon the present-day world as a vortex with Asia somewhere near its center. It irritates and appalls him that Western statesmen subordinate this continent to Europe.

Nehru's furious championing first of Indians and then of Asians generally has penetrated the consciousness of India's millions. Though his breeding, intellectuality, and urbanity are far above that of the legions who follow him, he is accepted by them as one of their own and they take pride in his superiority over the herd.

Leadership of the masses came to Nehru as an earned encomium but not as something he ever sought for itself. Unlike most other Indians in political life, he broadened as his prominence grew and he never became a politician. Indeed, he professed disdain for factional maneuvering.

He took office as Prime Minister upon conclusion of the interim government in which he had been vice president under Viscount Mountbatten's viceroyalty. Hardly had the first grave, hopeful words of the new Domini-

ion's leaders and well-wishers died away when ominous rumblings came from the Punjab. Immediately upon the inauguration communal rioting spread across more than a thousand miles. This was followed by an unplanned exchange of populations, about 5,000,000 Hindus and Sikhs migrating to India and a slightly larger number of Moslems fleeing to Pakistan—all in fear of their lives, stripped of their land, and most of them utterly denuded of their possessions except the garments on their backs and what they could pile onto bullock carts.

The blow to the new Prime Minister was staggering. To the credit of Nehru and his colleagues it may be said now—what they would not have admitted at the time—they survived a period of trial that might well have unseated them. Nehru himself drove through angry villages of the Punjab pleading for a return of reason. Often he lost his renowned temper and castigated rioters in a way that, according to observers on the spot, might have resulted in assassination of a less revered personality.

Though it is not his special project, a Refugee Rehabilitation Ministry was soon established. Problems of refugees still have a hold on Nehru and doubtless will for years to come. A man of great compassion for his suffering countrymen, he gives his personal attention to the desperate plights of individuals when they come to his attention.

India's Prime Minister has reminded some American observers of the late Mayor F. H. LaGuardia, of New York, in his zeal for taking personal hold of relatively minor situations and driving through a remedy. Once, two cars collided before his eyes in an intersection near the government buildings. He personally hauled the victims from the wreckage and, at his personal direction, a safety island of old oil drums was installed at the intersection immediately.

Now, somewhat to his regret, Nehru finds that his job keeps him more and more away from common contacts. His major attention is focused on foreign affairs. The greater burden of domestic matters comes under the widely inclusive ken of his Deputy Prime Minister, State's Minister and Home Minister Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel. Patel is responsible for internal security and the policing which has put an end to communal rioting. His State's Ministry—with the former Indian Civil Service official, V. P. Menon, as actual executive—accomplished the stupendous feat of erasing India's more than 500 semi-independent princely states from the map and making the country a solid political unit for the first time.

Besides acting as a gadfly to numberless internal projects that actually come under other ministries, Nehru, as Minister of External Affairs, took hold of India's foreign policy. This was a new field.

He immediately stepped into the dispute with Pakistan over the Princely State of Kashmir, a dispute which President Truman recently termed a threat and urged be settled at once.

One powerful drive behind India's interest in Kashmir, a mountainous sparsely populated northern state of doubtful commercial or strategic value, is Nehru's sentimental attachment to that land. His forefathers migrated from Kashmir about 200 years ago, but he still speaks of himself as a Kashmiri.

"We may have been wrong on many things," Nehru once emphatically remarked, "but on Kashmir we are dead right."

As Prime Minister he has seized also on the problems of Jumagh and Hyderabad, two intransigent states with Moslem rulers, and he sanctioned the military action that brought them into the Indian fold. In any matter affecting relations between India and Pakistan, these being external affairs, Nehru exerts his influence.

One has the impression from a study of his activities in the past 2 years that his pri-

mary interest lies in guiding India's course in relation to other nations. Here he is, of course, swayed one way or another by his two passions: Asia for Asians and racial equality everywhere.

He really burst forth into world affairs with his convening of the Asian conference in defense of Indonesia. By that, he made himself the No. 1 man in Asia without doubt, and the size and importance of his country—what Ambassador Loy Henderson referred to as India's specific gravity—assures his continuance in that position so long as he is at the helm of Indian affairs.

Nehru's devotion to Asiatic causes is not, however, new. It goes back at least 22 years when he attended a conference of dissident colonial people in Europe. There he met Dr. Mohammed Hatta, Premier of Indonesia. When Hatta launched his postwar movement for an independent Indonesia, Nehru made himself the virtual godfather of the new republic. It was his monumental rage at the Dutch police actions of last December that impelled him to invite 19 powers to the conference in New Delhi in January. This conference itself, of which Nehru was chairman, was mostly a tentative show of muscle. However, it did affirm Nehru's position in Asia. This mantle of leadership was not, however, received with unbounded joy by other Asiatic nations.

China, considerably more of an entity then than she was to be in the months immediately following, was not too pleased. The Philippine delegate showed a tendency to grab the ball and this has since been followed, significantly, by Philippine President Elpidio Quirino's sponsorship with Chiang Kai-shek and President Syngman Rhee of South Korea of an Asian pact against communism—from which Nehru, incidentally, is quietly abstaining. Some in Siam and Ceylon, too, looked a bit askance at the sudden eminence of their colossal neighbor.

Still Nehru stands as the strongest figure in a troubled continent, and his delegates to the United Nations are continually striving for a stronger voice in those councils. It is expected that India will continue to contest for vacant seats on the Security Council until she gets one. Then her status will be doubly asserted. As a newcomer in the world arena Nehru's capacity for leadership in international endeavors possibly has not reached its apex.

Nehru's most brilliant triumph in international relations, however, and one of the farthest reaching in concrete effect was his achievement at the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers of a formula whereby India could become a republic—as she will next January 26—and yet remain in the Commonwealth. Nehru's simple expedient was to recognize the symbolism of the King in the Commonwealth while at the same time renouncing allegiance to the British Crown.

Now near the pinnacle of an eminence both he and his associates fully appreciate, Nehru has averted a government crisis simply by threatening to resign. Where Gandhi addressed great crowds in a fatherly tone Nehru often rails at them and they accept it with admiration, for although the Indians are supposed to be of gentle nature, they have been trained through long centuries to accept harshness from above. Nehru, with impunity, has gone so far as to step off the speaker's platform and physically assault persons creating a disturbance anywhere near him.

Though he frequently rebukes his people with the sternness of a schoolmaster, Nehru takes passionate exception to any foreign criticism of those Indian traits about which he himself is so often impatient. This is a contradiction which has only endeared him with his people, no less than the personal contact he keeps alive by frequent appearances all over India. Always an indefatigable traveler—by air—and speaker, his pro-

gram of cornerstone laying and speechmaking has been intensified since the confinement of Deputy Prime Minister Patel by illness.

Doubtless a part of Nehru's immense popularity stems from an attribute common to most great personalities, or even to bad ones—color. In conversation or in speech making his features are a panorama of his thoughts. His moods glow in his eyes and face so that there is no mistaking them. He will be kindly and humorous and then, taking up a subject that displeases him, will thunder and shake with anger. These quick rages are accepted by Indians and foreigners alike as genuine. If he has ever been acting he has certainly been very good at it.

Indians are accustomed to long speeches and Nehru's are as nearly interminable as any. He speaks extemporaneously, even on the radio, and rambles over many fields. His spoken English, like his writing, is often extraordinarily eloquent—he is not so good in any Indian language. There are some here who consider his impetuosity no asset at all in these times.

It would take pages to list all the concerns of India's Prime Minister. He has been criticized for taking on too much for any one man. Before he moved into the guarded mansion of the former British Commander in Chief of the Indian Army, it was not far wrong to say that anyone could see him just by walking in. Now his privacy is assured, but he spares many hours for interviews with newspaper correspondents, politicians of high and low rank, and all manner of deputations.

The Prime Minister works an 18-hour-day. This begins at about dawn with a half hour of his favorite Yogi exercise—standing on his head. Besides whatever beneficial physical effect standing on one's head may have for Nehru, he finds that the attitude puts him in good humor for the start of his labors. He says his troubles and worries seem to fade away when one looks at the world upside down. This, of course, is basic Yogi philosophy.

His diversions are extremely rare. An excess of public adulation forbids his indulging in his favorite sport, horseback riding, or to go walking in public. Either is likely to provoke a friendly mob scene. He customarily works at his home until after 2 o'clock in the morning, and if he is persuaded by his sisters or daughter to relax for an hour or two he usually makes it up by staying at his desk an equal time after his usual late bedtime.

A large part of Nehru's accomplishment for his country in 2 years cannot be measured by any handy yardstick. Much of his service consists of exerting his powerful personality upon others—upon his Cabinet, his colleagues in the Congress party working committee, upon Parliament, to which he occasionally administers a tongue lashing, and through his speeches to hundreds of thousands of his people.

The ultimate aim of his efforts can be stated very simply: to bring India to a decent standard of living and position of influence in the world. No one who knows Nehru doubts that his motive in seeking a stronger voice for India is a sincere desire to impart to the world that philosophy of brotherhood which is the heritage of India's ancient civilization and which received new life and meaning from Gandhi.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Washington Post of October 11, 1949]

WELCOME TO NEHRU

The arrival of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the Capital today will be an event of great import in the relations between East and West. Nehru comes as Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs of India. But

these titles do less than justice to his prestige in his own country. He is a founding father, second only to Gandhi in the people's veneration. He wears a halo in his own lifetime—more or less like Mannerheim's in Finland or Masaryk's in Czechoslovakia. Neither's problems, of course, could compare with Nehru's, either in complexity or scope. Within India a sixth of the human race live, divided into innumerable classes and minorities. Nehru's task is to weld them into a single whole in a state based upon the liberal tradition. It is mammoth undertaking—one that is complicated by the fact that India is still bedeviled by the border problems left by the partition with Pakistan, but one which has shown so much progress that that very fact has given Nehru a towering stature beyond the confines of his own country.

Few men in charge of great affairs are more gifted than Nehru. Pandit means learned one, given to all Kashmiri Brahmins, to which his family belongs; but the honorific suits the mind of Nehru as well as his pedigree. Incidentally, Nehru's lineage doubtless explains an attitude toward the allegiance of Kashmir which would otherwise be incomprehensible. Kashmir is a major issue in India-Pakistan relations, but a man of Nehru's great authority could dispose of this problem without inviting much trouble from his own constituency. There is a precedent in this respect in his adroit handling of the issue over separation from the British Crown. Equipped to act according to his own lights, he severed the link, and then agreed to a new link through the Commonwealth. The solution was as brilliant as it was statesmanlike. India is as free as any country in the world, and exercised its sovereignty to become a member of a new community. Nehru by this act demonstrated not only the hold he has on the Indian people, but also the kinship he recognizes between his love of country and love of mankind.

The unique leadership exercised by Nehru is at once hierarchic and democratic. He knows the "art of being a king." At the same time he has a common touch which excites the sympathy of all kinds and conditions of India's population. He can stir millions with pen or tongue. This is the man we are now going to see. We want to know him, and we want him to know us, partly because of his own dynamic personality, partly because he has a contribution to make to world pacification. His vast country is an island in a continent of turmoil which makes the truth hard to discern. It would be the part of wisdom to listen to what he has to say on how to deal with Asia. His reading should tell him that the people of this country has its anti-Colonial past in its marrow, and his look at us—hurried and kaleidoscopic, though it is being made to be by the schedule-makers—may, let it be hoped, show him some of the folkways of America, where the good life is being lived.

LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader when it is planned to proceed with the consideration of the Executive Calendar. I have in mind the question of the confirmation of the nomination of Leland Olds. I am wondering what the Senator's plans are for considering that question.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that I think probably following the disposition of the farm bill we shall take up Senate bill 2319, which is a bill reported unanimously from the Committee on Foreign Relations. I discussed that bill with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CON-

NALLY], and he is anxious to have it considered and disposed of one way or the other.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the distinguished majority leader tell us the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. It is Calendar 757, Senate bill 2319, providing aid for Korea.

I should say to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who, as I know, is very much interested in an early vote on the nomination of Mr. Olds, that there will be no question so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned about the Senate voting on Mr. Olds' nomination. As to the exact time, I am unable to say. I will say that certainly some time this week we shall reach it and get it out of the way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point which greatly concerns me is the fact that so many Senators are planning to be absent. It seems to me that we ought not to take any chances on not having a quorum present in the closing days of the session.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from Colorado that we ought to have a quorum here until we get through. So far as I am concerned, when we talk about a quorum being present, there are two or three other measures which are far more important from the standpoint of the welfare of the country than is the appointment or disappointment of Mr. Olds. I am thinking of the farm bill, for one. To me it is all-important to pass a farm bill of some kind. If we do not have a quorum present when the conferees finally come back with the farm bill, we shall have no farm legislation at this time.

The displaced-persons bill is an important measure. A number of Senators are wondering why that cannot go over until next year. But I think we have a commitment to the Senate and to the American people at least to try to do something toward the liberalization of the Displaced Persons Act. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, we are going to do that.

Those are matters of great importance. There are other bills which are more important than the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Olds. However, I can assure my friends, who I know are vitally interested in this nomination, that certainly within the next 2 or 3 days the nomination will be taken up and disposed of.

With regard to the question of Senators going to Europe at this particular time, whoever goes, I suppose the result will be a 50-50 proposition. The Senator's forces will not be greatly reduced as a result of trips to the Old Country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not too much worried about the ratio. What I am worried about is whether we shall have enough for a quorum, in view of the number of Senators who have booked passage. Having booked passage, they say they must go.

Mr. LUCAS. If we do not have a quorum, it will be too bad. I cannot be responsible for keeping here Senators

who desire to go to Europe or any other place. So long as there is business to be taken care of before the Senate—and I have said this frequently—so far as I am concerned, we are going to remain here. Whenever Senators get ready to go home or go to Europe or to South America, or some other place, if we cannot get a quorum I cannot be responsible for it. They will have to accept that responsibility in their own States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why do not we stay in session tonight, and finish the farm bill tonight?

Mr. LUCAS. I told the Senator from Nebraska earlier in the day that we would stop at 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the majority leader to know that it will be perfectly satisfactory to me to have the Senate remain in session tonight, but an announcement was made earlier in the day that we would stop at 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, and I assume responsibility for that.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Let me ask this question: I understand that when action on the farm bill is completed, the majority leader expects to take up the bill for aid to Korea, Senate bill 2319, Calendar 757.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the majority leader care to state what will be the program after that bill is disposed of?

Mr. LUCAS. There is Calendar No. 957, Senate bill 2317, authorizing grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities, and so forth. We probably shall take up that bill. There is some opposition to the bill by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Following that, we could take up Calendar No. 1134, Senate bill 2383, a bill to make effective the International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what I should like to know, if the distinguished majority leader will yield to me, is this: Does the majority leader expect to have the Senate take up that bill prior to the time when the motion to discharge the Judiciary Committee from the further consideration of the displaced persons bill is taken up or prior to the time when the displaced persons bill is taken up?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not say as to that. It all depends upon what the Judiciary Committee does. If the Judiciary Committee does not report a bill on the subject, I can say to the Senate now that immediately following the disposition of the farm bill, we shall take up the motion to discharge the Judiciary Committee from the further consideration of the displaced persons bill.

Mr. WHERRY. So when action on the farm bill is completed, if the Judiciary Committee has not then reported the proposed legislation regarding displaced persons, it will then be the pur-

pose of the majority leader to have the Senate take up the motion to discharge the Judiciary Committee from the further consideration of the displaced persons bill, and that will follow the farm bill. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. That does not mean that we shall not take up the executive calendar sometime during the debate on these matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Why cannot we take up the executive calendar some evening, and have a night session?

Mr. LUCAS. We may do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the matter with doing that tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to know whether we shall have another call of the Legislative Calendar, on which there are some important bills, for instance Senate bill 333 and a companion House bill, authorizing the appointment of three additional judges for the municipal court for the District of Columbia. We certainly wish to pass such important bills, if possible.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly there is plenty of work to be done. So I am warning Senators that they had better stay around.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader if we might have opportunity to give consideration to Senate bill 2002, Calendar 1126. That is a simple little bill which will permit the cities of Duluth and Superior, Wis., to construct a bridge.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for the information; I am glad to find one of those simple little bills.

Mr. THYE. This bill will cost the Federal Government no money. The bill will simply authorize the two cities to levy a toll to obtain revenue with which to pay the expenses of the bridge. There will be no Federal expenditure. The House passed the bill this afternoon. In fact, if the Senate would consider the bill at once, we could dispose of it in the next minute.

Mr. LUCAS. We would have to have a quorum call first, I am afraid.

Mr. THYE. It is a simple bill; it does not involve any Federal appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader whether he intends to have a call of the Legislative Calendar again before the session adjourns.

Mr. LUCAS. We shall have a call of the Legislative Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to know whether the majority leader intends to have a night session tomorrow night. Question as to that was raised by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure that we shall not have a night session then. I am not sure that we would take up the Olds nomination then.

Mr. WHERRY. I am doing my best to cooperate. All I should like to know is whether there is to be a night session. If there is to be one, we shall work toward that. If there is not to be one, we shall arrange our time accordingly.

Mr. LUCAS. If all Senators will work that way, that will be helpful.

Mr. WHERRY. I am delighted to cooperate in that way; I have constantly tried to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest that we have a night session; I have already had my dinner.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry, but announcement has already been made that we would not have a night session tonight.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why not have a night session tonight?

Mr. LUCAS. I am always happy to cooperate with the Senator, especially after he has had a good dinner. Perhaps other Senators have not had theirs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, how about my suggestion that we have a night session tomorrow, to take up the Olds nomination?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot guarantee that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It would be well to announce that beforehand.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator will have all his votes assembled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is not the reason for my suggestion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if the reason for the delay is the desire to get votes?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator from Texas; I yielded to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. For the past several weeks, I have been reading in the newspapers and in articles by various columnists that the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was engaged in some kind of a big plot to keep nominations from coming before the Senate or from reaching the Executive Calendar; and many of the articles have urged that action be taken.

We called the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] back from his vacation, so as to hold hearings, because of the pressure to have the nomination reported. We have hurried as fast as we could. We reported the nomination, but now we cannot even have it brought up in the Senate for a vote. I cannot understand that.

Mr. LUCAS. It will come up for a vote in due course. I wish to congratulate the committee for reporting the nomination. I think the committee has taken exactly the proper course. I do not care whether a nomination gets a single vote in the committee; I think every nomination should be reported. Nominations should not be bottled up in committee, as was done in the case of the nomination of Mon Wallgren.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is exactly the position I took in the committee. I said I would not be in favor of bottling up the nomination. I wish to say that several Senators suggested that the nomination be bottled up, but I opposed that.

Mr. LUCAS. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado for his opposition to the bottling up of a nomination of this kind. I do not think it is the proper practice to bottle up nominations; I do not think any committee has a right to determine whether its members shall be the only Senators who will have an opportunity to give advice and consent to a nomination. I think that right belongs

to the entire Senate, under the Constitution.

But I do not know why I have to be rushed into this matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield to my very delightful and lovable friend, the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for extending that privilege to me.

I wish to say that I do not know whether the committee is to be congratulated or not. The committee reported the nomination upon what it thought was assurance that as soon as it was reported it would be considered by the Senate. The Senator from Illinois was very persuasive upon the Senator from Texas when he stated what he thought about the full Senate's having the right to pass upon nominations, and the Senator from Texas thought he had the assurance of the Senator from Illinois that when the nomination was reported it would not be bottled up on the floor. [Laughter.]

The Senator from Texas does not say it has been bottled up on the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But word is going around the corridors—I am sure it is not coming from the Senator from Illinois—that certain persons are not so anxious to have that nomination considered as they were a few days ago, when the present speaker was in Texas.

The Senator from Texas understood the Senator from Illinois to request that the committee not act until at least Tuesday, and the Senator asked the committee to withhold action until Tuesday. Last Tuesday the Senator from Illinois assured him it would be all right for the committee to proceed. The committee did proceed, by a unanimous vote of 7 to 0.

On Wednesday the full committee took action, and it was the understanding of the Senator from Texas that the nomination would be considered by the Senate shortly after it was reported.

Finally, the Senator from Illinois indicated he would take up the nomination on Monday. When the matter was brought up on the floor, the Senator from Illinois said "Maybe," "Perhaps," "It may be brought up on Tuesday." The Senator from Texas has some plans—not to go to the Old Country, because he has some matters to dispose of here before he leaves.

Mr. LUCAS. A good many of us are in that situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas hopes he may be able to dispose of them. I think it would be a good thing if we could have some indication of the day on which the vote will be taken, so the Members of the Senate can arrange their plans accordingly.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator consider the nomination more important than the farm bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. The Senator from Texas would be glad to have it follow the farm bill, but the Senator from Texas does not consider the nomination less important than did the Senator from Illinois last week, when

the Senator from Texas was in Texas, and he was called and told the President of the United States wanted the nomination reported to the Senate. The Senator from Texas reported it, with what he thought was the assurance of the Senator from Illinois that it would be considered.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois never telephoned the Senator from Texas to tell him anything of the kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas did not even so indicate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois did not ask the Senator from Texas—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas did not so indicate.

Mr. LUCAS. Let us get the record straight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The record is straight. The Senator from Texas said he was in Texas when he received a message to the effect that the President of the United States wanted the nomination reported to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I therefore understood that the Senator from Illinois wanted it reported.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois is following the instructions of the White House, and the Senator from Illinois is going to get a vote on the Olds nomination. The statement has been circulated in the Senate, and even bets have been made as I understand—I do not know how much, but in small amounts at least—that the Olds nomination would not come up for vote in the United States Senate. I cannot understand why so many people are interested, for some cause or other, in getting an early vote on the Olds nomination. If I give assurance there will be a vote on the Olds nomination some time this week, that ought to suffice. If the Senator is going to pin me down to the exact hour, he may not get a vote at all. I am going to give the Senator an opportunity to vote on the Olds nomination, but I am not now going to be badgered or intimidated or coerced into stating the exact hour we are going to take the vote, regardless of how much interest certain Senators have in getting Mr. Olds out of the way once and for all.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say he had been acting under the direction of the President and under the instructions of the President?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri knows I am the majority leader.

Mr. DONNELL. I am asking the Senator whether I understood him correctly.

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment. The President of the United States sent word that he wanted the nomination of Mr. Olds brought to the floor of the Senate—and it is here. The Senator from Illinois was the one, of course, with whom the President of the United States would probably take up the matter. That is

the business of the Senator from Illinois. If the Republicans ever get into power—which I do not think they ever will [laughter] and if the Senator from Missouri becomes majority leader—which I hope may happen, sometime—then the Senator from Missouri will be on the telephone frequently with someone in the executive branch of the Government who happens to be a Republican President, and he will get some orders once in a while probably that he may want to carry out for the President of the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure, knowing the great fidelity the Senator from Missouri has for any position he takes, if he ever should be called upon on his side of the aisle to assume the role of majority leader of the Senate, and he received an order or two from the executive branch of the Government—it would not have to be very serious—he would carry it out. This is not a very serious order.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator has referred several times, at least twice, to orders from the President.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no one ever gives the Senator from Illinois any orders.

Mr. DONNELL. That is what the Senator said.

Mr. LUCAS. No orders.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not consider it the function of the President, on the one hand, to give any order to the Senate, or to any Senator, or the function of any Senator on the other hand to accept orders from the President of the United States. This is a Government of three distinct branches, and we are just as independent as is the President of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct about that. I am sure the Senator from Missouri is a little more independent than the President of the United States, so far as his voting record is concerned. I am not objecting to that, but, after all, the President of the United States sends to the Congress at the beginning of every session a message on the state of the Union, and he makes suggestions as to what the Senate and House should do in respect to legislation. I am happy to say the Eighty-first Congress has followed his suggestions about 60 percent already, and we are going to try to take care of about 25 percent of the remainder in the next session. So we shall have a pretty good record coming, not from orders of the President, but merely from suggestions when the President delivers a message to the Congress. The Senator from Missouri has been very fine on some of those things, too. He has gone along with us. I appreciate it, and I hope the Senator will continue from time to time to follow the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield again to my good friend.

Mr. DONNELL. I merely want to say most respectfully to the Senator from Illinois that while I appreciate the very kind words he has said, my recollection is that the function of the President under the constitutional provision is to deliver a message on the state of the Union and to make recommendations to Congress; but I know of nothing in the Constitution or anywhere else that says the Executive, the President, or any other officer has any right to issue orders to the United States Senate or to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; I agree.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure the Senator, on reflection, will agree with that observation.

Mr. LUCAS. I concur completely with the Senator from Missouri. But the President of the United States has sent to the Senate a nomination to an important office. He was anxious to have the Senate consider the nomination. I think the Senator from Missouri will agree with me that the President was not out of order in requesting, through the majority leader, that the committee report the nomination.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is perfectly within the proprieties for the President to express his desire.

Mr. LUCAS. That is all he did.

Mr. DONNELL. That is, his desire for information.

Mr. LUCAS. If I said he gave any orders—

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator, I may say, did say it. He said it in two or three words, "direction," "instruction," and "orders." I do not think, with all due respect both to the distinguished President and to the distinguished majority leader, that the Senate of the United States should for one instant concede directly or indirectly that any official has the right to issue orders to the Senate or to any Member of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct, and if I made that statement, it was not made in the sense in which the Senator from Missouri is now discussing. I think the Senator from Missouri knows the Senator from Illinois well enough to understand that it is a little difficult for anyone to tell the Senator from Illinois to take orders. I have been fairly independent in my service as a United States Senator. But a Senator is in a little different position when he is behind the majority leader's desk. I think the Senator from Nebraska will agree with me on that. He has been very cooperative all day, and I am sure he will be again. I thank the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, I move—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest that a session be held tomorrow night. I am very anxious that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LUCAS. We are going to recess until 11 o'clock in the morning. That ought to satisfy the Senator.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BUTLER was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the present session.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. That is another good vote gone for me. I regret to see the senior Senator from Nebraska leave, because he has been agreeing with us so much all along.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 12, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 11 (legislative day of September 3), 1949:

UNITED NATIONS

John C. Ross, of New York, to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Ernest A. Gross, of New York, now an Assistant Secretary of State, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the Security Council of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Jack K. McFall, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Ernest A. Gross.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Harold C. Stuart, of Oklahoma, to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

George Earl Hoffman, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Florida. Mr. Hoffman is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 28, 1949.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Rex Bryan Hawks, of Oklahoma, to be United States marshal for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Dave E. Hilles, term expired.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Joseph F. Farley, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, to be an admiral on the Coast Guard retired list effective upon his retirement on January 1, 1950, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the act approved March 21, 1945 (50 U. S. Code, Appendix 1724).

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate October 11 (legislative day of September 3), 1949:

SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

John C. Ross to be deputy representative of the United States of America, with the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, in the Security Council of the United Nations.

POSTMASTER

IDAHO

J. D. Petty, Meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

For innumerable manifestations of Thy love, our Heavenly Father, we return thanks. So impart to Members of this body Thy restoring and sustaining presence that they may never make peace with evil nor regard as futile any effort to right the most stubborn wrong.

May America keep aflame and aloft the torch of freedom as she moves amid the complexities and confusions of a dark world. Give guidance and blessing, O Lord, to those who direct the destinies of our land.

Grant that from the family of nations discord may depart and that over its members the scepter of the Prince of Peace may hold sway. Enable us to walk this day in the path of righteousness. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On September 9, 1949:

H. R. 1132. An act for the relief of Mabel H. Slocum; and
H. R. 2594. An act for the relief of Grace L. Elser.

On September 10, 1949:

H. R. 3829. An act to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes.

On September 19, 1949:

H. R. 4040. An act for the relief of Agnes Tarjani.

On September 26, 1949:

H. R. 1211. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

On September 27, 1949:

H. R. 1824. An act to amend section 433 (f) of the act of August 4, 1949.

On September 28, 1949:

H. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution to erect a memorial to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi.

On September 30, 1949:

H. R. 2944. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide survivorship benefits for widows or widowers of persons retiring under such act.

On October 1, 1949:

H. R. 1976. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3616. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird;

H. R. 3851. An act to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, with respect to surplus airport property and to provide for the transfer of compliance functions with relation to such property; and

H. R. 3886. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns.

On October 5, 1949:

H. R. 524. An act to provide for the release of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain portion of a tract of land conditionally granted by it to the county of Los Angeles;

H. R. 540. An act to provide terminal-leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 584. An act for the relief of Mike Clipper;

H. R. 588. An act for the relief of Col. David R. Wolverton, United States Army, retired;

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of Edgar Barbre;

H. R. 1620. An act for the relief of Robert E. Bridge and Leslie E. Ensign;

H. R. 1800. An act for the relief of Howard E. Giroux;

H. R. 2015. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey and exchange certain lands and improvements in Grand Rapids, Minn., for lands in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Frank G. Moore;

H. R. 2619. An act to extend the benefits of the annual- and sick-leave laws to part-time employees on regular tours of duty and to validate payments heretofore made for leave on account of services of such employees;

H. R. 2678. An act to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890, as amended, relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, so as to permit the leasing of school lands within such State for mineral purposes for terms in excess of 10 years;

H. R. 3405. An act for the relief of Vivian Newell Price;

H. R. 3534. An act for the relief of Eleanor P. Simmonds, as administratrix of the estate of Norman B. Simmonds, deceased;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Cecil E. Gordon;

H. R. 3864. An act to convey certain lands taken from W. W. Stewart by the United States;

H. R. 4050. An act to authorize advances of pay to personnel of the armed services upon permanent change of station, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4556. An act for the relief of the estate of Elmo Sodergren;

H. R. 4875. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to travel expense allowances for Government employee witnesses;

H. R. 5310. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of California over the lands and residents of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in said State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5342. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment to the Boy Scouts of America for use at the Second National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts;

H. R. 5356. An act to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co. in Stoughton, Mass.;

H. R. 5465. An act to amend section 4 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5670. An act authorizing transfer of land to the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, for a hospital site;

H. R. 5773. An act to authorize the carrying out of the provisions of article 7 of the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico, regarding the joint development of hydroelectric power at Falcon Dam, on the Rio Grande, and for other purposes; and